DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 006 CS 006 935

AUTHOR Webb, Norman L.
TITLE Summative Evaluation of Reading for a Reason: A Reading Series for Grades 7 and 8.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Educational Communications Board, Madison.
PUB DATE 29 Sep 82
NOTE 95p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Content Area Reading; *Educational Television; Grade 7; Grade 8; Junior High Schools; *Program Evaluation; Reading Comprehension; *Reading Improvement; *Reading Programs; Reading Skills; Summative Evaluation; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Reading for a Reason; Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

A summative evaluation of the instructional television series "Reading for a Reason" was conducted during the spring of 1982 as part of the premier showing of the series over the Wisconsin Educational Television Network. The series consisted of eight programs designed to teach skills for content area reading to seventh and eighth grade students. Each program presented skills and techniques that could be used to get meaning and retain information from reading textbooks and other expository materials. The study involved over 1,300 students who were given a pretest and posttest, and over 60 teachers who completed questionnaires or supplied supplementary information. A version of the Solomon Four Group Design was used because this design makes it possible to determine the effects of testing. The tests were composed of three parts--a reading style inventory, a comprehension test of the TV series elements, and a reading comprehension test. Findings from the evaluation show that (1) students at grade 7 who had used the series reported using techniques that were conducive to effective reading more frequently than did the control group; (2) students at both grade levels learned statistically more about specific skills presented in the program than did the control group; and (3) taking into consideration the pretest scores, students in grade 7 who used the series scored significantly higher on the main idea reading scale. Teachers on the whole reported being satisfied with the series and gave the series and its manual a positive overall rating. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224006

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Summative Evaluation

of

READING FOR A REASON

A Reading Series for Grades 7 and 8

by Norman L. Webb
Manager of Educational Research

September 29, 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Norman L. Webb

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CSDD 6935

Wisconsin Educational Communications Board

Summative Evaluation of READING FOR A REASON
A Reading Series for Grades 7 and 8

by
Norman L. Webb
Manager of Educational Research

September 29, 1982

Wisconsin Educational Communications Board

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	v
Summary	vii
Introduction	1
Purpose	4
Design	5
Results	9
Student Outcomes	12
Reading Style Inventory	12
Reading Scales	16
Summary of Student Outcomes	24
Teacher and Student Reactions	25
Teacher Review of Programs	32
Conclusions	38
Appendix A	43
Appendix B	47
Appendix C	57
Appendix D	69
Appendix E	81

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Number of Classes by Experimental and Control Groups and by Grade	6
2	Percent Correct on Reading Scales Contrasting Evaluation Groups with State Assessment Results for Grade 8, 1979 and 1980.	10
3	Test Statistics for Reading Scales II-VII for Posttest Experimental Group.	11
4	T-Test Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Class Means for Reading Style Inventory Between Experimental and Control Groups by Grade.	13
5	Analysis of Covariance on Posttest Class Means for Reading Style Inventory Using Pretest as Covariate by Grade	13
6	T-Test Comparison of Posttest Means of Reading Style Inventory Items Between Experimental and Control Groups by Grade.	15
7	Class Mean Scores and Changes from Pretest to Posttest on Reading Style Inventory by Grade and Use of Series.	17
8	Summary of Means, Standard Deviations, and Differences on Posttest Means for Experimental and Control Groups by Grade	19
9	Analysis of Covariance on Posttest Class Mean for Scale II: Comprehension of Series Elements Using Pretest as Covariate by Grade. . .	20
10	Analysis of Covariance on Posttest Class Mean for Scale III: Factual Information Using Pretest as Covariate for Grade 8.	20
11	Analysis of Covariance on Posttest Class Mean for Scale IV: Main Idea Using Pretest as Covariate for Grade 7.	21
12	Analysis of Covariance on Posttest Class Mean for Scale VII: Fact from Opinion Using Pretest as Covariate for Grade 7.	21
13	Percent Correct on Items from Posttest Scale II: Comprehension of Series Elements for Experimental and Control Groups by Grade	23
14	Mean, Standard Deviations, and Ranking of Eight Programs by Teachers Who Participated in Review.	33
15	Mean, Standard Deviations, and Ranking of Lesson Features by Program by Teachers Who Participated in Review	34
16	Mean, Standard Deviations, and Ranking of Lesson Activities by Program by Teachers Who Participated in Review	35

List of Tables (continued)

Table		Page
D1	T-Test Comparison of Posttest Class Means on Reading Style Inventory by Grade Testing the Effects of Pretesting.	71
D2	T-Test Comparison of Pretest Means of Reading Style Inventory Items Between Experimental and Control Groups by Grade.	72
D3	T-Test Comparison of Posttest Means of Reading Style Inventory Items Between Experimental Groups Pre-Post and Post Only by Grade	73
D4	T-Test Comparison of Posttest Means of Reading Style Inventory Items Between Control Groups Pre-Post and Post Only by Grade.	74
D5	T-Test Comparison of Pretest Means on Reading Scales Between Experimental and Control Groups by Grade.	75
D6	T-Test Comparison of Posttest Means on Reading Scales Between Pretested Group and Post Only by Use of Series and Grade.	76
D7	Analysis of Variance Testing the Main and Interactive Effects of Pretesting on Posttest Scores for Reading Scales by Grade.	77

SUMMARY

READING FOR A REASON is an instructional television series of eight programs designed to teach skills for content area reading to seventh- and eighth-grade students. Each program presents skills and techniques that can be used to get meaning and retain information from reading textbooks and other expository materials.

The summative evaluation of the series was conducted during the Spring of 1982 as a part of the premiere showing of the series over the Wisconsin Educational Television Network. Reading teachers and specialists at the middle school and junior high level were given the opportunity to participate in a teacher review of the series. A random sample of the 160 teachers who agreed to participate in this review by March 5 were selected to have students tested as part of the evaluation. A version of the Solomon Group Four experimental design was used. In this design, one experimental and one control group were given both a pretest and posttest, and one experimental and one control group were only given a posttest. In addition to student tests, teachers were asked to complete a questionnaire on the series and questions on each of the programs. The participants in the study included over 1,300 students who were tested--approximately 400 grade 7 experimental, 400 grade 8 experimental, 290 grade 7 control, and 200 grade 8 control. Over 60 teachers completed questionnaires. The tests administered were composed of three parts--a Reading Style Inventory (16 items), a Comprehension of Series Elements (10 items), and Reading Scales (13 items pretest and 21 items posttest).

Based on results from the reading scales which were also used as part of the 1980 state pupil assessment, the students in the study were comparable in reading ability to the students from the state. Findings from the evaluation show that

students learned more about skills for content area reading. Students, particularly at grade 7, who had used the series reported using techniques more frequently that were conducive to effective reading than did the control group. Students at both grade levels learned statistically more about specific skills presented in the programs than did the control group. Grade 7 students who used the series scored significantly higher on the Main Idea Reading Scale than did the control students after taking into consideration the pretest scores. Teachers were satisfied with the series, with approximately two-thirds of the teachers giving the series and manual a positive overall rating. Teachers felt the technical quality was high and that the content adequately covered the major skills in content area reading. Teachers commented that the series contained important information not easily available from other resources. In certain situations that appeared to be the result of the local situation and not generalizable to the series as a whole, students did not attend well to the program or did not relate well to the characters. The mode time spent on activities related to the series was 45 minutes per program.

INTRODUCTION

READING FOR A REASON is an instructional series of eight 15-minute programs for students in grades 7 and 8. The series is designed to help students become more effective readers of textbooks. Main points of the series are that most reading material is presented in two basic forms--narrative and expository--and that reading expository material is important and often can be more demanding than reading narrative material. Each program is devoted to ideas related to reading expository material. (See Appendix A for listing of objectives.) Program 1 presents the difference between expository and narrative reading and serves as an introduction to the series. The next six programs discuss having a purpose when reading; the organization of textbooks; skills needed to get meaning from a textbook; knowing what is inferred by the author; fact contrasted with opinion and bias; and strategies to help remember what is read. The eighth program reviews material presented in the other programs and how the skills used for reading in one content area can be transferred to other content areas.

The prime force for producing the series came from teachers and reading specialists who identified reading at grades 7 and 8 and, in particular, content area reading as a curriculum area having a real need for additional instructional resources. Junior high school reading was one of the most frequent areas mentioned by teachers responding to the triennial needs assessment survey administered to all teachers in Wisconsin during the 1978-79 school year. A content area advisory committee composed of reading specialists, teachers, university reading educators, and Department of Public Instruction supervisors guided the refinement of the content and its specifications. With the help of the committee, a survey was designed and then sent to a random sample of 351 seventh- and eighth-grade teachers in Wisconsin. The results of this survey reconfirmed the need for reading education at grades 7 and 8 and showed that the suggested topic for the series

given by the most teachers was reading for comprehension and for content. Based on information from the survey, the advisory committee designated content area reading as the main focus of the series, identified the goals for the series, and specified the program objectives. A report of the results of the content advisory committee was written June 1980*.

The production of the series involved the interaction of reading educators with television production professionals. Doug Vance, a reading consultant for a Madison high school and president of the Wisconsin Reading Association, served as content consultant by preparing the content outline for each program and reviewing scripts. The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay Center for Television Production had the responsibility of writing the scripts and producing the programs. Larry Long from the Center was the writer and director of the series. Thomas De Rose, manager of program development for the Educational Communications Board, coordinated the overall project. The teacher's manual was written by Katherine Kasten and Nancy S. Haugen whose backgrounds and experience include reading education and writing.

A pilot program for the series was completed in January 1981. The formative evaluation of the program involved 16 middle or junior high schools, including at least one from each of the seven Wisconsin ITV viewing regions. Nearly 900 seventh and eight graders participated in the evaluation. The results of the evaluation of the pilot program guided and provided input into the writing and production of the eight programs of the series. The production of these programs began in the Summer of 1981 and were completed in time for the airing of the first program over the Wisconsin ETV network on March 23, 1982.

As a part of the premiere airing of the series over the network, teachers in the state were given an opportunity to review the series and provide suggestions for

*Thomas De Rose. "The Reading Series: A report on the results of the content advisory committee meetings." (Madison, Wis.: Educational Communications Board, June 19, 1980.)

the improvement of programs and the refinement of lessons in the teacher's manual. This teacher review was conducted with the expectations of using teacher feedback to primarily fine tune the written lessons and, only if an acute problem occurred, to make changes in programs. In February 1982, over 800 teachers and reading specialists were sent a brochure describing the series and explaining the teacher review process. Teachers could indicate their wish to participate in the review by returning a form included as a part of the brochure. By the closing date of March 5, approximately 160 teachers had expressed their wish to participate. In addition, nearly 200 more teachers returned forms after the closing date. Teachers wishing to participate in the review were sent an interim teacher's manual which included a questionnaire after each lesson. This questionnaire asked teachers to give their reaction to the program as well as that of their students. Thus, teachers had input in the series beginning with the identification of the need for a reading series for grades 7 and 8, continuing with their help in the specifications of the content and formative evaluation of the pilot program, and following through with their review of the completed product for fine tuning the series and its supporting materials.

A few teachers received some in-service on the series, but these were mainly isolated cases. The regional service unit (RSU) utilization consultants were given a workshop on the series on February 4, 1982, to provide them with material and activities to be used for teacher in-service workshops. Only a few in-services were conducted by the RSUs prior to the airing of the series. In addition, presentations were made by Educational Communications Board (ECB) staff at two state conferences--the Governor's Conference on Basic Skills in December 1982 and the Wisconsin State Reading Association Annual Meeting on March 19, 1982. It can be assumed that most of the teachers using the series the first airing had not received any special in-service.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the evaluation was to assess student outcomes that were the result of the series and teachers' opinions of the series. Included as possible outcomes were change in attitudes toward reading expository material and other reading habits, learning of specific content presented in the programs, and improvement in reading skills. Because of the relatively short period of time (eight weeks) that the series will be used compared with the years students have had to develop reading skills, the main outcomes were anticipated to be in the change of attitudes and the learning of specific content presented in the programs. Because the teachers are the gatekeepers of the use of the series in the classroom, a part of the evaluation was devoted to assessing teachers' opinions of production features, content, student outcomes, and utility of the series. The more value teachers see in the series, the more chances the series will be used. The evaluation was designed to assess outcomes that are the result of using the series and not outcomes attributed to individual programs.

The evaluation was designed to answer the questions:

1. What are the attitudes of teachers and students toward the series?
2. What are student outcomes that are the result of using the series in the areas of attitudes toward reading expository material and other reading habits, specific content of the series, and reading skills?
3. How do teachers use the series and activities that are included in the teacher's manual?

DESIGN

A modified Solomon Four Group Design was used for the testing of students. This design employs four groups--one group using the series was pretested and posttested; one group using the series was only posttested; one control group was pretested and posttested; and one control group was only posttested. The value of this design is that main effects of testing and the interaction of testing and the series are determinable, which increases the generalizability of the results*. Theoretically, all groups should be randomly selected. In this case, only the experimental groups were.

The sample of teachers and their classes that composed the two experimental groups were randomly selected from the first 160 teachers who agreed to participate in the teacher review. Each teacher, when asked to have students tested, was also asked if there would be classes not using the series from that school that could be used as control classes. When possible, a control class was selected to match a class using the series. In some cases, this was impossible since a remedial reading class was using the series and the only available class for control was an English class with average- to above-grade level students. The final sample included 63 classes of students--30 grade seven, 31 grade eight, and two high school remedial reading classes containing students in grades 9 through 11. Table 1 shows how these classes were distributed among the experimental and control groups. The sample included classes with a range in reading abilities. Some classes were devoted to helping students who were reading below grade level, in some cases reading at the grade 3 or 4 level. Some of the classes were reading or

---

*Donald T. Campbell and J.C. Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-experimental designs for research. (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1973). p. 25.

English classes which contained students with a range in reading abilities. Some classes were composed of students primarily reading above grade level. As a result of this range in ability and being restricted in arranging control classes at schools with experimental classes, the match between the experimental group and control group at a grade level was not as close as desired. For grade 7 pretest-posttest groups, the control classes included a greater proportion of lower ability classes. For grade 8 pretest-posttest groups, the experimental classes included a greater proportion of lower ability classes.

Table 1

Number of Classes by Experimental and Control Groups and by Grade

Group	Grade			Total
	7	8	9,11	
Pretest-posttest experimental	9	10	2	21
Pretest-posttest control	4	4		8
Posttest only experimental	9	11		20
Posttest only control	8	5		13

The evaluation included students from schools in most regions of the state and with a range of demographic characteristics. At least one school which had students participating was located in each of the six regional service units. The regions with the largest number of schools participating were Northwest Instructional Broadcast Service (NIBS) with seven, and Southeastern Wisconsin In-school Services (SEWIST) with six. The communities where the schools were located ranged in size from under 1,000 to over 50,000 and included ones located in rural, suburban, and urban fringe areas. There were no schools in the evaluation from the Milwaukee Public Schools or from other inner-city areas. Inner-city schools were contacted but the procedures necessary to get permission for their

participation required too much time from that which was available. With the exception of inner-city students, the sample included students from all areas of Wisconsin and from a range of sites of communities reflective of those that exist in Wisconsin.

Three types of instruments were used to collect data. Tests, described in more detail below, were administered to students as pretests for some of the students and as posttests for all of the students. The pretest was made up of 39 items divided into six scales. The posttest contained the same items as the pretest and an additional seven items. This test was divided into seven scales. Teachers whose classes were tested and a random sample of the review teachers whose classes were not tested were asked to complete a questionnaire. This teacher questionnaire included questions about attitudes toward program elements and the series, the appropriateness of the content, impressions of student outcomes, and the utility of the series. A list of interview questions administered by the regional service unit representatives was the third instrument used. These questions were similar to those in the teacher questionnaire but were put in an open-ended response format. The student tests are included as Appendix B. The teacher questionnaire and teacher interview questions are included as Appendix C.

The six scales forming the pretests are a reading style inventory (16 items), comprehension of series elements (10 items), factual information (four items), inferring a conclusion (four items), fact from opinion (four items), and main idea (one item). In addition to these scales, on the posttests three more items were added to the main idea scale and a scale on cause and effect (four items) was included. All of the items are multiple choice with four or five choices. The reading style inventory was developed by reading specialists for use at middle school and high school level to assess reading habits and interests. The

comprehension of series elements is 10 items written specifically to assess the understanding and recall of content of the programs. These items are based on the main objectives of the programs. The remaining scales were taken directly from tests for the Wisconsin Pupil Assessment Program administered by the Department of Public Instruction. The assessment program reading tests were administered to samples of eighth-grade students from Wisconsin both in 1979 and 1980. The purpose of these scales is to measure reading skills that have been developed over a period of years. It was not anticipated that there would be large increases in scores on these scales over the eight-week period that READING FOR A REASON was used. Scores on these scales did allow some comparison between students participating in the evaluation and the state norms for eighth graders. The particular scales used from the state assessment were selected because they relate to content in the series. There was a possibility that slight change in scores on the reading scales may be related to the use of the series. However, the greatest changes were expected to be seen in the reading inventory and series elements scales.

A series of analyses were conducted on the data. Descriptive statistics of frequencies, means and standard deviations were computed for the teacher questionnaire data. The student test data were broken down into scales and then item analyses performed. Class was used as the unit of analysis for the comparison between experimental and control groups. The reading inventory was analyzed by item using t-tests. The equivalence of the different groups on the other scales was assessed by also using t-tests. Analysis of variance was used to determine if there was an effect of pretesting. If the effect due to pretesting was negligible and the assumptions were met, analysis of covariance was used to compare scores on the scales for the experimental group and control group using pretest scores as the covariant.

RESULTS

The results of the summative evaluation are described in this section. First, student outcomes are described based on information collected by the student tests administered as a pretest and a posttest. Second, attitudes of teachers and students determined from the teacher questionnaire and questionnaires completed as part of the teacher review process are discussed. Finally, how the series was used by teachers will be described.

The sample of students that participated in the evaluation of READING FOR A REASON were comparable in reading ability to the general population of students in the state. In Table 2 the percent correct on the reading scales is given for each of the evaluation groups and for the eighth graders who took the scales in 1980 and 1979. The percentages correct for the statewide group are given in the right-hand columns. Or most of the scales, the seventh graders scored the same or slightly below the statewide scores for eighth graders. The eighth graders in the evaluation were generally within three or four percentage points of the scores from the statewide assessment.

The descriptive statistics for Scales II through VII on the posttest for experimental students are given in Table 3. The reliability on Scale II, Comprehension of Series Elements, is lower than desired. However, this scale included items related to a range of reading skills. The reliability of .417 and the standard error of 1.47 indicate that students were somewhat inconsistent in responding to the questions. Information on individual items on this scale may be more meaningful than one scale score over the 10 items. The reliabilities on the other scales are reasonable considering each scale had four items. Using the Spearman-Brown formula to project the reliabilities on these scales if there were 16 items, the projected reliabilities would range from .77 to .89.

Table 2

Percentage Correct on Reading Scales Contrasting Evaluation Groups with State Assessment Results for Grade 8, 1979 and 1980

	READING FOR A REASON Evaluation								State Assessment Grade 8 Statewide	
	Grade 7				Grade 8					
	Experimental		Control		Experimental		Control			
	Pre (N=226) %	Post (N=401) %	Pre (N=72) %	Post (N=291) %	Pre (N=169) %	Post (N=414) %	Pre (N=85) %	Post (N=212) %	1980	1979
III Factual Information	82	80	77	77	79	80	76	80	80	82
IV Main Idea	59[b]	67	56	57	68	69	62	71	66	NA[d]
V Cause and Effect[c]		60		54		63		66	64	NA
VI Inferring a Conclusion	60	61	54	52	64	64	70	67	63	NA
VII Fact from Opinion	74	76	68	62	76	76	84	74	63	73

[a]Percent correct for a group is the average of the percent correct scored by the group on items forming the scale.

[b]Only one item was included on the pretest relating to Main Idea. This is the percent correct on that one item.

[c]Items from this scale were not included on the pretest.

[d]NA (not applicable) indicates that the scale was not included on the 1979 state assessment.

Table 3

Test Statistics for Reading Scales II-VII
for Posttest Experimental Group
(N=862)

	Scale	Items	Reliability KR-20	Mean	S.D.	Standard Error of Measurement
II	Comprehension of Series Elements	10	.417	5.51	1.93	1.47
III	Factual Information	4	.522	3.18	1.02	.71
IV	Main Idea	4	.512	2.70	1.19	.83
V	Cause and Effect	4	.461	2.43	1.18	.86
VI	Inferring a Conclusion	4	.524	2.49	1.24	.86
VII	Fact from Opinion	4	.679	3.01	1.20	.68

Student Outcomes

Reading Style Inventory. The series had an effect on students' reading habits as reported by them on the Reading Style Inventory. The change in reading style--the increase of positive responses to items--was particularly evident at grade 7. The difference in the mean total score on the Reading Style Inventory between the grade 7 experimental classes and control classes was significant at the .02 level (Table 4) using a "t" statistic. At grade 8, the difference was not significant, however the experimental classes did have a higher mean than did the control classes. No significant differences were found between the experimental groups and control groups at either grade prior to using READING FOR A REASON, as seen in Table 4. Also, having taken the pretest did not have an effect on the posttest scores, which was indicated by no significant differences between those classes taking the pretest from those who did not within each of the two groups, experimental and control. Information on this analysis is reported in Appendix D, Table D1. The significant effect of the series on the Reading Style Inventory scores of grade 7 students was also apparent when the pretest scores were accounted for using an analysis of covariance (Table 5). The assumption of homogeneity of regression coefficients was tested and found to be tenable for both grade levels. These findings imply that the series had an effect on the overall score of the Reading Style Inventory at grade 7 but not at grade 8. That is, grade 7 students reported being more aware of habits favorable to effective reading of expository materials after viewing the series than they did before viewing the series.

Table 4

T-Test Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Class Means for Reading Style Inventory Between Experimental and Control Groups by Grade

Test	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Diff	t	Prob.
Grade 7					
Pretest	53.69	53.82	.13	.09	.93
(number of classes)	(N=9)	(N=4)			
Posttest	56.43	52.81	3.62	2.36	.02*
(number of classes)	(N=18)	(N=12)			
Difference (post-pre)	2.74	-1.10			
Grade 8					
Pretest	52.45	55.13	-2.68	1.15	.28
(number of classes)	(N=8)	(N=4)			
Posttest	56.29	55.01	1.28	1.04	.31
(number of classes)	(N=19)	(N=9)			
Difference (post-pre)	3.84	- .12			

Table 5

Analysis of Covariance on Posttest Class Means for Reading Style Inventory Using Pretest as Covariate by Grade

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	F Value	P Level of Significance
Grade 7				
Series	1	51.15	7.81	.02
Pretest Mean	1	81.02		
Error	10	59.00		
Total	12	191.17		
Grade 8				
Series	1	5.70	0.43	.53
Pretest Mean	1	9.22		
Error	9	115.94		
Total	11	130.86		

READING FOR A REASON had a significant effect on changing specific reading habits, as measured by individual items from the inventory, at both grade 7 and grade 8. The classes who used the series scored significantly higher than the control classes at both grade levels on three of the 16 inventory items (Table 6). This is particularly significant since there were no statistically significant differences on these items between the experimental and control classes on the pretest (see Appendix D, Table D2) or between classes within each of the experimental or control groups taking pretests and those not taking pretests (Tables D3 and D4). The three items on which differences were observed are:

2. I read textbooks in a different way from how I read stories.
9. I put what I read into my own words to help me remember it.
10. I ask myself questions like who, what, where, when, why, and how after reading a chapter to be sure I know the message.

In addition to these three items, significant differences were also found at seventh grade favoring the classes using the series on five more items--4 (a definite purpose for reading is kept in mind), 5 (raise questions while reading), 8 (look at surrounding words and sentences to determine the meaning of a word), 12 (skim materials), and 15 (use different reading skills for different subjects).

The items on which significant differences occurred indicate that the series had an effect on general reading skills that related to the flexibility of the students and their reflectiveness in reading. More of the students using the series had a higher awareness than did the control classes that textbooks are read in different ways from stories. More students using the series indicated they were more reflective in their reading than did the control students by reporting that they put what they read into their own words and asked themselves questions about what they read. These reading skills relate to two of the programs rated by

teachers as being the most instructional--program 1 (narrative and expository writing are different and require different reading strategies) and program 7 (strategies are used to remember information when reading, including asking questions and paraphrasing). Teacher comments will be discussed in later sections. Thus, that the series had an effect is strengthened by the fact that specific content from the programs relates directly to those items where the greatest difference favoring the experimental classes was found.

Table 6

T-Test Comparison of Posttest Means of Reading Style Inventory Items Between Experimental and Control Groups by Grade

	Grade 7			Grade 8		
	Posttest Mean			Posttest Mean		
	Experimental (N=18)	Control (N=12)	|t|	Experimental (N=19)	Control (N=9)	|t|
1. Comfortable reading texts	3.30	3.34	0.36	3.36	3.53	1.66
2. Read texts differently	3.90	3.47	3.38**	3.90	3.54	2.59*
3. Work until have meaning	3.49	3.25	1.96	3.44	3.53	0.73
4. Keep in mind purpose	3.39	3.06	2.34*	3.39	3.35	0.39
5. Raise questions while reading	3.01	2.72	2.33*	3.06	2.85	1.53
6. Try to remember	4.03	3.82	1.76	4.01	3.85	1.57
7. Use clues	3.77	3.72	0.37	3.83	3.84	0.13
8. Word meaning from surroundings	3.83	3.53	2.26*	3.79	3.82	0.28
9. Put into own words	3.41	3.13	2.33*	3.40	3.12	2.59*
10. Ask myself questions	2.97	2.51	3.56**	3.01	2.74	2.05*
11. Attend to punctuation	3.32	3.27	0.29	3.37	3.38	0.04
12. Skim before reading	3.27	3.00	2.30*	3.22	3.09	1.41
13. Know fact from opinion	4.20	4.02	1.67	4.13	4.12	0.08
14. Discuss with others	2.89	2.67	2.00	2.86	2.93	0.48
15. Use different reading skills	3.47	3.18	2.16*	3.40	3.23	1.46
16. Aware reading skills can be improved	4.32	4.23	0.81	4.22	4.23	0.13

*significant at .05 level
**significant at .01 level
Note: For a significant level at .05, need to have t value greater than 2.00.

One more way of studying the effect of the series on the Reading Style Inventory is by looking at the change in mean scores between the pretest and posttest of those classes which took both tests. At grade 7, of the nine classes using the series, six had gains and three had essentially no change (Table 7). Of the four grade 7 control classes, three had decreases in scores and one had essentially no change. At grade 8, of the eight classes using the series, four had gains, three essentially had no gains, and one had a decrease in scores. Of the four grade 8 control classes, only one had a gain, one had essentially no change, and two had decreases. The consistency between grades of a number of the experiental classes gaining in scores on the inventory and a number of the control classes decreasing in scores indicates the positive effects of the series.

Reading Scales. The series did not have an effect on scores at either grade level on four of the six scales assessing different reading skills (Table 8). Classes which viewed the series did have a significantly higher mean score on Scale II testing the comprehension of specific reading facts present in the eight programs. This was true for both grade 7 and grade 8. Seventh grade classes who viewed the series also scored significantly higher on Scale IV, Main Idea. Table 6 shows the summary information for the pretest and posttest of the six scales. The right most column indicates the difference in the posttest scores between the experimental and control classes. Results from t-tests comparing the scale mean on three different contrasts--experimental vs. control on pretest; experimental, which took pretest, vs. the post-only experimental classes on the posttest; and the control, which took pretest, vs. the post-only control classes on the posttest--are given in Appendix D in Tables D5 and D6. On these contrasts, no significant differences were found except for one scale which indicates that the experimental and control classes scored statistically similar on the pretest, and that taking

Table 7

Class Mean Scores and Changes from Pretest to Posttest on Reading Style Inventory by Grade and Use of Series

School	(Number of students)	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Difference
		Grade 7 Experimental		
1	(24)	57.96	61.33	3.37
2	(25)	52.68	51.96	-0.72
3	(24)	54.46	55.17	0.71
4	(26)	51.58	59.46	7.88
5	(19)	55.47	59.58	4.11
6	(25)	51.88	57.68	5.80
7	(20)	54.35	57.60	3.25
8	(37)	54.57	59.43	4.86
9	(9)	48.89	48.67	-0.22
		Grade 7 Control		
1	(22)	54.18	52.68	-1.50
2	(26)	54.27	52.85	-1.42
3	(26)	55.19	55.04	-0.15
4	(23)	51.52	50.43	-1.09
		Grade 8 Experimental		
1	(19)	51.10	51.79	.69
2	(30)	45.33	59.07	13.74
3	(37)	57.05	60.11	3.06
4	(24)	54.21	51.25	-2.96
5	(14)	48.86	49.57	0.71
6	(20)	57.40	56.80	-0.60
7	(20)	55.95	58.20	2.25
8	(6)	50.33	56.17	5.84
		Grade 8 Control		
1	(16)	54.69	52.75	-1.94
2	(25)	54.48	52.00	-2.48
3	(24)	54.42	56.25	1.83
4	(19)	57.16	57.00	- .16

the pretest did not have a strong effect on the posttest scores. The one significant difference found for grade seven was between the pretested control group and the post-only control group on the posttest score of the Main Idea Scale. The mean score of the four classes which were pretested was significantly lower than the mean score of the eight classes not pretested. Thus, on this scale the two control groups cannot be pooled as one without considering pretest scores.

In addition to the above, analyses of variance were performed in preparation of doing an analysis of covariance using the pretest as the covariate. The purpose of the 2 x 2 analysis of variance on the posttest scores with the use of the series as one variable and pretesting as the other was to determine if the main and interactive effects of pretesting were negligible so that analysis of covariances could be performed. The results of the analyses of variances are given in Appendix D in Table D7.

On two of the scales (IV and VII) for the grade eight classes there was a signficant effect due to the pretest. That is, the experimental groups and control groups were sufficiently different on these scales from the beginning that no further analysis was warranted. On Scale III for grade 7 the assumption for analysis of covariate of the homogeneity of variance was not satisfied. The analysis of covariance was performed on all of the other scales except on these three where it was inappropriate.

Table 8

Summary of Means, Standard Deviations, and Differences on Posttest Means for Experimental and Control Groups by Grade

Scale	Experimental		Control		Difference
	Pretest Mean (SD)	Posttest Mean (SD)	Pretest Mean (SD)	Posttest Mean (SD)	Posttest Mean Exp-Control
	Grade 7				
	(N=9)	(N=18)	(N=4)	(N=12)	
II Comprehension of Series Elements (10 items)	4.68 (.72)	5.54 (.74)	4.76 (.41)	4.48 (.40)	1.06*
III Factual Information (4 items)	3.25 (.35)	3.14 (.43)	3.11 (.16)	3.15 (.35)	-.01
IV Main Idea (4 items) (Scale VI on Pretest) (one item)	.58 (.15)	2.21 (.26)	.60 (.14)	1.96 (.25)	.25*
V Cause and Effect (4 items)		2.40 (.44)		2.30 (.46)	.10
VI Inferring a Conclusion (Scale IV on Pretest) (4 items)	2.46 (.36)	2.41 (.47)	2.20 (.55)	2.26 (.55)	.15
VII Fact from Opinion (Scale V on Pretest) (4 items)	2.93 (.39)	3.02 (.53)	2.85 (.41)	2.72 (.40)	.30
	Grade 8				
	(N=10)	(N=21)	(N=4)	(N=8)	
II Comprehension of Series Elements (10 items)	4.63 (1.02)	5.35 (.93)	5.24 (.34)	4.61 (.52)	.74*
III Factual Information (4 items)	2.95 (.43)	3.11 (.65)	3.28 (.31)	3.08 (.84)	.03
IV Main Idea (4 items) (Scale VI on Pretest) (one item)	.64 (.18)	2.11 (.45)	.64 (.07)	2.12 (.36)	-.01
V Cause and Effect (4 items)		2.37 (.68)		2.56 (.44)	-.19
VI Inferring a Conclusion (Scale IV on Pretest) (4 items)	2.32 (.68)	2.42 (.63)	2.89 (.34)	2.58 (.70)	-.16
VII Fact from Opinion (Scale IV on Pretest) (4 items)	2.80 (.79)	2.91 (.64)	3.34 (.14)	2.88 (.94)	.03

*significant difference at the .05 level

Statistically significant effects due to the series at the .05 level were found for grade 7 on Scales II (Comprehension of Series Elements) and Scale IV (Main Idea) based on the analysis of covariance where pretest scores were used as the covariate (Tables 9-12). The series had an effect on Scale II for grade 8 at a statistically significant level of .06 (Table 7).

Table 9

Analysis of Covariance on Posttest Class Mean for Scale II: Comprehension of Series Elements, Using Pretest as Covariate by Grade

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	F Value	P Level of Significance
		Grade 7		
Series	1	2.63	8.26	.02
Pretest Mean	1	2.29	7.18	.02
Error	10	2.90		
Total	12	7.82		
		Grade 8		
Series	1	3.05	4.49	.06
Pretest Mean	1	2.98	4.38	.06
Error	11	6.03		
Total	13	12.06		

Table 10

Analysis of Covariance on Posttest Class Mean for Scale III: Factual Information Using Pretest as Covariate for Grade 8

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	F Value	P Level of Significance
		Grade 8		
Series	1	0.12	0.14	.72
Pretest Mean	1	0.78	0.91	.36
Error	11	9.24		
Total	13	10.14		

Table 11

Analysis of Covariance on Posttest Class Mean for Scale IV: Main Idea, Using Pretest as Covariate for Grade 7

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	F Value	P Level of Significance
		Grade 7		
Series	1	0.57	6.85	.02
Pretest Mean	1	0.25	2.98	.12
Error	10	.77		
Total	12	1.59		

Table 12

Analysis of Covariance on Posttest Class Mean for Scale VII: Fact from Opinion, Using Pretest as Covariate for Grade 7

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	F Value	P Level of Significance
		Grade 7		
Series	1	0.19	1.18	.30
Pretest Mean	1	2.68	16.58	.002
Error	10	1.79		
Total	12	4.66		

These results support that students did learn some of the reading facts or information about reading skills from using the series that those who were part of the control did not. From an item analysis (Table 13), the five items where there were the greatest differences between the experimental classes and control classes are item 17 (reading material which reports facts, details, opinions and ideas is called expository), item 18 (class discussions, the assignment, classwork, and what will be on a test can help you to know your purpose for reading a textbook), item 19 (to focus your attention on the important ideas as you read a textbook, you should know your purpose for reading), item 22 (headings, pictures, study aids, questions, and topics are clues for identifying the author's message in a textbook), and item 24 (three signal words that are helpful to get meaning from textbooks are but, first, and furthermore). Even though significant gains occurred on the scale of comprehension of series elements, the mean score at both grade levels was still only slightly above 50% of the items (Table 6). Students who used the series showed some growth on items relating to specific facts included in the programs, but the series had little or no effect on half of the items in this scale.

On the five remaining scales taken from the state assessment instruments, no significant differences occurred between the experimental group and control group except on the Main Idea Scale for the grade 7 classes. The mean score of the experimental classes exceeded the mean score of the control classes on this scale. This is somewhat a surprise since it was anticipated that no differences would be found on these scales which measure reading skills that have been developed over a period of years. By going deeper into the data, the findings indicate that there is a high probability that the series had an effect on increasing scores of the experimental classes on the Main Idea Scale. Each of the four grade 7 control classes which took the pretest were from schools where there was one grade 7

Table 13

Percent Correct on Items from Posttest Scale II: Comprehension of Series Elements for Experimental and Control Groups by Grade

Item Number	Description	Grade 7			Grade 8		
		Exp. (N=401) %	Control (N=291) %	Difference Exp-Control	Exp. (N=414) %	Control (N=212) %	Difference Exp-Control
17.	Expository material reports facts, details, opinions, ideas.	66	24	22	59	31	28
18.	Class discussions, the assignment help you to know your purpose for reading a textbook.	54	38	16	52	39	13
19.	Knowing your purpose for reading helps you focus on important ideas.	30	17	13	37	22	15
20.	Table of contents shows the organization of the textbook.	73	69	4	75	70	5
21.	Skills are useful for finding the main ideas.	56	48	8	56	58	-2
22.	Headings, pictures, and others are clues for identifying the author's message in a texbook.	36	24	12	36	22	14
23.	Sometimes you have to put facts together when reading a textbook.	69	67	2	66	74	-8
24.	But, first, and furthermore are signal words.	61	36	25	56	28	28
25.	To read critically means to make judgements about information.	48	43	5	50	47	3
26.	Asking yourself questions, forming mutual images and others are ways to remember what was read.	63	61	2	64	70	-6

experimental class. The teachers reported information on the reading abilities of the two classes at each of these schools which indicate that the two classes at each school are comparable in average abilities. On the pretest, the four control classes had an average score of .60 on the one item relating to main idea, whereas the four experimental classes' average score was .64. One item is not sufficient for reliable information, but it does suggest that the classes were not too different prior to the experimental classes viewing the series.

On the posttest, large differences did occur. Each of the control classes had a mean score on the Main Idea Scale less than the experimental class from its school. The mean score of the four experimental classes was 2.26, whereas the mean score of the four matched control classes was 1.75. That the series actually had an effect on increasing scores on the Main Idea Scale at grade 7, then, is strengthened because of the findings from these four schools, located in different areas of the state, which had both a grade 7 experimental class using the series and a grade 7 control class. At each of these schools the experimental class scored higher than the control class on the Main Idea Scale. Also, at grade 7, 14 of 18 experimental classes (78%) had a mean score higher than three-quarters of the control classes. This consistency across schools increases the likelihood that the finding is due to the series and not just a chance occurrence.

Summary of Student Outcomes. Significant results were found indicating positive main effects from using the series on items from the Reading Style Inventory for grades 7 and 8; on total score and individual items of the Comprehension of Series Elements Scale for grade 7 particularly and, but not as great, for grade 8; and on the Main Idea Scale for grade 7. Students who used the series were more aware of what expository materials are, reported using more frequently some skills that can be used to more effectively read textbooks, and, at least for the seventh-grade

level, were better able to determine the main idea from a passage than were the control students. The series had a greater effect on grade 7 students than on grade 8 students.

Teacher and Student Reactions

All the teachers whose students were tested as part of the evaluation were asked to complete a questionnaire about their own and their students' reactions to the series. In addition, 60 teachers who were selected at random from the remaining teachers participating in the teacher review of the series were also sent questionnaires. A total of 29 teacher questionnaires were received, at least one from 21 of the 22 schools where tests were administered. From the other 60 teachers, 29 questionnaires were received. Some of these 60 teachers had decided not to use the series or had had some technical problems which prevented them from viewing the series.

A chi-square analysis was performed on the responses from the two groups of teachers, those whose students were tested and those whose students were not tested, to assess if the two groups were independent. Only one significant statistic at the .05 level was found. This was on the item which asked if the material presented was mostly new to students, was evenly distributed between review and new material, or was mainly review. For the students in the test group, the material was mainly new. For the students of teachers in the other group, the material was evenly distributed between review and new material. Based on this chi-square analysis, it is apparent that the teachers whose students were tested reacted very smiliarly to the series as did those whose students were not tested. This increases the evidence that the results from the evaluation are more generalizable to the larger group of teachers using the series than just to those whose students were tested.

The percentages and means for the items on the teacher questionnaire are given in Appendix C. Overall, teachers were positive toward the series and the manual. Sixty-nine percent rated the series overall as very good or excellent, and nearly all of the teachers (94%) expressed satisfaction with the series. Nearly all of the teachers agreed at least somewhat that activities in the manual were good applications of ideas in the programs (88% on item 5.15) and that the manual was useful (86% on item 5.16). The manual was rated as very good or excellent by 67% of the teachers (item 2).

On the production of the series, teachers were very positive toward the technical quality as indicated by positive responses ranging from 84% to 97% on items 5.3, 5.4, and 5.9. Nearly all of the teachers felt the series was not a waste of time (91% on item 5.2) and that they will use the series in the future (86% on item 5.6). Most teachers (90%) felt the series was as good or better than most educational television. Only 7% of the teachers disagreed with this statement (item 5.1). Teachers were more favorable toward the characters, ranging from 67% to 83% positive responses regarding the teenage characters and Tim (items 5.7, 5.8, 5.10, and 5.11) than were their students. Only from 41% to 59% favorable responses were recorded for items asking about how the teachers' students responded to the characters and series (items 5.12-5.14).

The students were less favorable toward Tim and the teachers were less favorable toward the teenage characters. In general, teachers appreciated the series, felt it was of high technical quality, felt the manual was useful, and felt that they will use the series in the future. Teachers were less positive toward the characters and how they perceived their students felt toward the characters.

Teachers were positive toward the content presented in the series and felt it provided information not easily available from other resources. All of the

teachers felt the content was important (item 6.1), and 91% felt the content of the series adequately covered the major skills in content area reading (item 6.2). However, about one-third did feel that some important skills were left out (item 6.3). Teachers were very favorable toward how the content was presented with regard to the sequence (item 6.4), accuracy (item 6.5), understandability (item 6.6), and amount of content (item 7), with nearly 80% or more positive responses. However, the content was generally not new to students, with 65% of the teachers reporting that the content was mostly review or distributed between review and new material (item 8). A number of the teachers (59%) did feel that the programs provided information not easily available from other sources (item 6.7). Thus, teachers found value in the content of the series.

A large percentage of the teachers felt that their students learned from the series. There was some problem, as reported by one-third of the teachers, in the programs keeping the attention of students (item 9.1). However, nearly all (over 80%) of the teachers felt that their students understood the content (item 9.3) and learned more about skills for reading textbooks (item 9.2). A little lower percentage, but still 76% of the teachers, thought that the series helped their students to read textbooks more effectively (item 9.4), and 67% thought the series increased the confidence of students in reading textbooks (item 9.5). As reported by the teachers, students learned more about reading skills from the series and, in many of the classes, teachers felt the series helped their students to read textbooks more effectively and to be more confident when reading textbooks.

Teachers felt that the series was easy to use and that the manual was useful. Over 80% responded positively to the manual, its usefulness, and the ease in preparing for programs (items 10.1 and 10.5-10.8). Over 90% of the teachers felt that the series was important enough to allocate time (item 10.3), and that the

vocabulary was appropriate for their students (item 10.4). However, teachers in general, nearly 50%, did not feel that the programs provoked discussion from their students. Seventy-nine percent of the teachers felt that the pace of the program was appropriate for their students (item 12). The other 20% of the teachers were split between feeling the pace was either too slow or too fast. The series and the manual are very useable by teachers. The programs do lack some in generating discussion by students. The average amount of classroom minutes spent each week on the series was 49 minutes. The mode time was 60 minutes.

The grade levels and reading abilities of the students of the 58 teachers who completed the questionnaire varied. A total of 132 classes were reported using the series in this group--60 (45%) grade 7, 52 (39%) grade 8, 16 (12%) grade 9, 3 (2%) grades 10 and 11, and 1 (1%) grade 6. The average reading level of 50 (40%) of the classes was reported as below grade level, 58 (47%) at grade level, and 16 (13%) above grade level.

The series was used in a variety of different types of classes. Of those that were reported, 44% of the classes using the series were reading, 22% were developmental or remedial reading classes, 14% were English, 11% were language arts, and 3% were literature and reading classes. Other class types where the series was used in one or two classes included geography, social studies, content reading, resource (study skills), and speed reading. The series was used by more classes at grade 7 and by those reading at or below grade level. Thus, the series was used in different class types and by a range of grade and ability levels.

A large percentage of teachers, 71%, had not used any other ITV series with their students during the school year. Thus, the series interested a group of teachers not normally using ITV. The largest percentage of teachers (81%) felt the series was most appropriate for eighth graders, followed by 74% recommending it for

seventh graders, 52% for ninth graders, 38% for sixth graders, and 19% for tenth graders.

There appeared to be some differences in responses by teachers of seventh-grade students from those of eighth-grade students that suggest differences in the reaction to the series by students depending upon their grade level. The characters, Tim and the teenagers, were liked better by seventh graders than by eighth graders. The programs provoked more discussion in seventh-grade classes than in eighth-grade classes. However, the manual was rated higher by eighth-grade teachers. The sequence of the programs and topics was felt to be more appropriate for eighth graders than for seventh graders. The teachers expressed the same level of satisfaction with the series whether the content of the series was for the most part new or review. However, the overall rating of the series and manual were rated higher by those for which the content was mainly new or evenly distributed between review and new material. These teachers also reported that their students learned more from the series and gave stronger agreement to the statement that the series helped their students to read textbooks more effectively.

When asked for suggestions for how the manual and/or programs could be made more effective (item 15), 35 of the 58 teachers responded (Appendix E). Many of the comments were not criticisms of the programs, but were reactions to the time of year that the series was broadcast and the designated age level. Several teachers felt the series should be shown in the fall so that the students could benefit from the programs throughout the year. Other teachers disagreed on the most appropriate grade level and ability level of the series. One teacher felt the programs were above the level of the seventh graders who came from a rural area. For this teacher, the students in the programs seemed a little old for some seventh graders to relate to. On the other hand, another teacher felt the programs talked down to

eighth and ninth graders, and that the series should be used with sixth and seventh graders.

There was also a similar mixed feeling as to what ability level of students the series is most appropriate. Some teachers suggested that the programs should be used in developmental or remedial reading classes, while others felt the series would be better with students who were reading at or above grade level. One possible reason for these conflicting views of the series is the expectations of the teachers for the series. A teacher of remedial readers found that the series did not motivate her students to be interested in content area reading. The series was designed more to present the skills and less as motivator. So if a teacher is expecting a motivating tool rather than instructional material, the teacher will probably view the programs differently.

Other comments regarding features of the series for which teachers suggested improvement covered a spectrum. Some teachers felt that the programs moved too slowly. Some students acted negatively to the "contrived settings." Some students reacted more negatively to some of the programs than to others, but these programs varied from school to school. Some classes felt the standard opening of each program became tedius after the second or third time. Some teachers felt the programs moved too slowly and did not include enough information. Another teacher felt the series tried to do too much. This teacher commented that one technique for content area reading should be used to develop a couple of programs. The suggestions given by teachers were not consistent enough across teachers and varied enough from teacher to teacher to imply that the problems may be a factor of an interaction between a particular situation and group of students, rather than a general problem with the series itself.

Of the 32 teachers that gave other comments (item 18), a large percentage of these were positive and expressed thanks for a series in a curricular area where resources are greatly needed. One teacher commented, "We have needed a series like this desperately. Thanks for developing a real educational tool for use, especially at middle-school level." Another teacher said, "Even though the material was mainly review for my students, a TV presentation had more impact and credibility." A third teacher reported, "Overall, I really feel that this type of a program is beneficial in teaching reading skills to use in the content areas."

In general, teachers were positive toward the series and felt that it helped to satisfy a need. In some situations, students were bored with some programs, felt that the teenagers did not act naturally, or were not very interested in some programs. These types of comments appeared to be more isolated to a particular situation and were not descriptive of the use of the series overall.

Teachers of control classes were asked to answer a few questions about reading skills taught during the time between the administration of the pretest and posttest. Nearly half of the seventh-grade teachers reported giving some reading instruction during that time. One had students regularly use the techniques in class. Another teacher used think sheets and the SQ3R program. At eighth grade, five of the six teachers said that their students had some instruction on skills related to content area reading. For example, one used a skill tactic book, one taught functional reading skills using the Laidlaw series, one used Design II for students not having the needed skills, and one teacher gave instruction on areas such as inference, context, and central focus.

Ten topics that are presented in READING FOR A REASON were listed on a questionnaire. Most teachers of control classes said that their students had received some instruction on nearly all of the topics. At grade 7, the topics that

were taught the least by the control teachers (about half of them) were differences between expository and narrative material, techniques for surveying material, techniques to highlight main ideas, and strategies to remember what is read. At grade 8, only two topics were not taught by over half of the teachers responding. These topics were the differences between expository and narrative material and recognizing the organization of a text. Based on this information, about half of the control classes at grade 7 and nearly all at grade 8 had some instruction on topics covered by READING FOR A REASON during the semester the study was conducted.

Teacher Review of Programs

As a part of the teacher review, teachers were asked to complete a questionnaire on each program and the supporting materials. A set of questions was placed in the interim manual as the last page of each lesson. The summary of the returned responses to these questions are reported in Tables 14, 15 and 16. Teachers were asked to rate the value of each program, the program features, and the activities using a five-point scale, with five representing the most positive and one representing the most negative responses. The programs rated the highest on their instructional value, entertainment, and student appeal were programs 1 (key idea: getting information from expository reading is something that everybody can learn if they really try), followed by programs 4 (key idea: you have to work at it to get the meaning of words) and 7 (key idea: there are strategies that can be learned to remember information). The programs rated the lowest were programs 3, 5 and 8.

Table 14

Mean, Standard Deviations, and Ranking of Eight Programs by Teachers who Participated in Review

Program Number	Program Title	Number of Teachers Evaluating	Was the Program... Instructional? Mean (S.D.)	Rank	Entertaining? Mean (S.D.)	Rank	Liked by Students? Mean (S.D.)	Rank
1.	A Different Kind of Reading	67	4.24[a] (.64)	2	3.76 (.86)	1	3.87 (.77)	1
2.	I Know the Reason	64	4.20 (.60)	3	3.59 (.77)	4	3.55 (.78)	5
3.	There's a Message for You	64	3.84 (.86)	6	3.27 (.84)	8	3.32 (.88)	6
4.	Everything Means Something	63	4.19 (.74)	4	3.62 (.89)	3	3.68 (.89)	2
5.	I Already Know That	40	3.83 (.94)	7	3.32 (1.05)	6	3.28 (.99)	7
6.	Is That a Fact?	38	4.05 (.92)	5	3.64 (.93)	2	3.58 (.81)	4
7.	The Way I Remember It	31	4.30 (.75)	1	3.53 (1.01)	5	3.63 (.96)	3
8.	Different Subjects, Different Messages	35	3.77 (1.06)	8	3.32 (.87)	7	3.27 (.83)	8

[a]A five-point scale was used: Not at All-1 and Very Much-5.

Table 15

Mean, Standard Deviations, and Ranking of Lesson Features by Program by Teachers Who Participated in Review

Program Number	Program Title	Number of Teachers Evaluating	Feature: Key Idea[a] Mean (S.D.)	Key Idea[a] Rank	Objectives[b] Mean (S.D.)	Objectives[b] Rank	Program Summary[c] Mean (S.D.)	Program Summary[c] Rank
1.	A Different Kind of Reading	67	4.11[a] (.79)	3	4.48 (.53)	1	4.39 (.70)	2
2.	I Know the Reason	64	4.31 (.85)	1	4.42 (.87)	2	4.43 (.89)	1
3.	There's a Message for You	64	3.85 (1.09)	6	3.93 (1.05)	6	4.02 (.97)	6
4.	Everything Means Something	63	3.91 (1.09)	5	4.15 (.98)	4	4.29 (.91)	4
5.	I Already Know That	40	3.72 (1.26)	8	3.67 (1.39)	8	3.69 (1.39)	7
6.	Is That a Fact?	38	3.82 (1.29)	7	3.95 (1.29)	7	3.65 (1.45)	8
7.	The Way I Remember It	31	4.00 (1.05)	4	4.27 (1.05)	3	4.37 (1.00)	3
8.	Different Subjects, Different Messages	35	4.22 (1.07)	2	4.09 (1.12)	5	4.22 (1.10)	5

[a]Question: Does the Key Idea communicate the content of the program?
Not at All (1) and Very Much (5)

[b]Question: Does the content of the program correspond to the lesson Objectives?
Not at All (1) and Very Much (5)

[c]Question: Did the Program Summary adequately describe the program?
Not at All (1) and Very Much (5)

Table 16

Mean, Standard Deviations, and Ranking of Lesson Activities by Program by Teachers Who Participated in Review

Program Number	Program Title	Number of Teachers Evaluating	Activity Type: Before-the-Prog.[a] Mean (S.D.)	Rank	Discussion[b] Mean (S.D.)	Rank	After-the-Prog.[c] Mean (S.D.)	Rank
1.	A Different Kind of Reading	67	4.07 (1.06)	1	4.25 (.73)	1	4.12 (.98)	1
2.	I Know the Reason	64	3.80 (1.19)	2	3.91 (.95)	2	3.76 (1.48)	3
3.	There's a Message for You	64	3.70 (1.18)	4	3.31 (1.31)	7	3.26 (1.50)	7
4.	Everything Means Something	63	3.34 (1.40)	5	3.73 (1.07)	3	3.83 (1.25)	2
5.	I Already Know That	40	2.89 (1.59)	8	3.38 (1.55)	5	3.40 (1.74)	5
6.	Is That a Fact?	38	3.24 (1.44)	6	3.36 (1.29)	6	3.42 (1.41)	4
7.	The Way I Remember It	31	3.76 (1.48)	3	3.62 (1.52)	4	3.33 (1.75)	6
8.	Different Subjects, Different Messages	35	3.23 (1.41)	7	3.31 (1.31)	8	3.21 (1.57)	8

[a]Question: Did the Before-the Program activities prepare your students for the program?--Not at All (1) and Very Much (5)

[b]Question: Were the After-the-Program Discussion activities useful to guide discussion of program objectives?--Not at All (1) and Very Much (5)

[c]Question: Were the After-the-Program activities useful to reinforce the objectives of the program?--Not at All (1) and Very Much (5)

Three features--key idea, objectives, and program summary--were included as a part of each lesson to describe to the teacher what the program was about and the instructional intent of the program. The two programs rated the highest by teachers on these features were programs 2 (key idea: if you know what you are going after, there is more of a chance you will find it) and program 1. The two programs rated the lowest on these features were programs 5 and 6.

The manual includes student activities for before the program, discussion points, and after-the-program activities. The three programs rated the highest by teachers on these activities were programs 1 followed by programs 2 and 4. The programs whose activities were rated the lowest were programs 3, 5 and 8. Overall, the programs felt by teachers to be better than the others were programs 1, 2, and 4. The programs rated the lowest were programs 5, 3 and 8.

The time spent by teachers in preparing for each program and lesson ranged from no preparation to over 60 minutes of preparation. On an individual program, from 7-20% of the teachers reported not doing any preparation. The mode of time spent by the largest number of teachers for preparation was 15 minutes for the first four programs and 10 minutes for the last four programs.

The mode of time spent on each type of activity was 10 minutes for before-program activities, 10 minutes for after-program discussions, 10 minutes for after-program activities, and 15 minutes for student activities. This totals 45 minutes as an estimate of the amount of time spent on related activities. This confirms the mode total time of 60 minutes reported on the teacher questionnaire as being used on the series in a week. This 60 minutes is broken down into 15 minutes for the program and 45 minutes for related activities. Most teachers did before-program activities and discussions following the program. At least 75% of the teachers reported spending some time on each of these for each of the

programs. A slightly lower percentage, 70%, did at least some after-program activities for each program. Student activity sheets were used by a lower percentage of 50-70%, depending upon the program. Thus, most teachers who reported information did activities related to the programs with their students.

A reminder was sent to all teachers in the teacher review to return the lesson questionnaire and other comments on the series. Fifteen teachers responded to this request. Twelve of these had decided not to use the series for different reasons. Three said they had technical difficulties or problems with their video tape recorder and were unable to view programs. Two found that the programs were inappropriate for their students and stopped using the series. One was a high school teacher and one was teaching fifth and sixth graders who read at the third or fourth grade level. Two teachers did not receive information in time. One just decided not to use the series. Others did not use the series in the spring because of time limitations, but reported planning to review it during the summer for possible use the next school year. The responses of the teachers who had used the series were favorable. It appears that the teachers who did not respond to the questionnaire did not do so because, for some reason, they did not use the complete series and not because they were displeased with the series.

CONCLUSIONS

The summative evaluation of READING FOR A REASON was a large study involving over 1,300 students from all regions of the state. Sixty-three classes of students, evenly divided between seventh and eighth grades, were tested. Over 60 teachers completed questionnaires or supplied supplementary information.

The evaluation was designed with check and balances to ensure that meaningful information about the effects of the series would be obtained. A version of the Solomon Four Group Design was used to determine the effects due to pretesting, as well as contrasting differences between control and experimental groups. Teachers whose classes were selected to be tested were randomly selected from a list of 160 teachers who had volunteered by a certain date to be a part of a teacher review of the series. Questionnaires were administered to all teachers whose students were tested and to a random sample of 60 of the nearly 100 teachers whose classes were not selected to be tested. A follow-up was conducted of nonrespondents to check on reasons why teachers decided not to use the series or had not returned the questionnaire. Class was used as the unit of analysis because the treatment, the series and the related activities, were done usually as a class. Pretests were administered to control the effect of prior learning and to assess changes in test scores due to the series. Control groups were tested so that possible learning effects found could be, with more certainty, attributed to the series rather than to other learning experiences.

What are the attitudes of teachers and students toward the series?

Nearly all of the teachers expressed satisfaction with the series. Approximately two-thirds of the teachers gave the series and the manual an overall

rating of very good or excellent. Teachers found sufficient value in the series for 86% of them to want to use the series in the future. Teachers were very positive toward the technical quality of the production and the content. All of the teachers felt the content was important and most felt that the series adequately covered the major skills in content area reading. A few teachers felt that the series tried to do too much and would have preferred having one technique presented in more depth over two programs. Some teachers were not as satisfied with how Tim was portrayed or the acting ability of the teenage characters. But these were a miniority and did not take away from the fact that the teachers overall were positive toward the series.

According to teachers, students learned from the series but were not as satisfied with the series as were the teachers. Only a little over one-half of the teachers felt that their students looked forward to viewing the programs. The students were also less satisfied wih Tim, the main character, than were the teachers. The dissatisfaction of some students appeared to be confined to certain groups of students rather than spread over the general population. Certain eighth-grade classes did not relate well to the series, whereas others did. Some teachers felt that the programs were above the heads of their sixth- and seventh-grade students who were reading at a level two or three grades below. The acceptance of the series also appeared to be a factor of the teachers' expectations. One teacher was looking for a motivating experience rather than material that taught specific techniques. Motivation was not the real purpose of the series. Dissatisfaction with the series appeared to be related to different expectations other than the intended purpose of the series. But there were some classes, however not the majority, that did have difficulty relating to the programs.

What are student outcomes that resulted from using the series in the areas of attitudes toward reading expository material and other reading habits, specific content of the series, and reading skills?

It is apparent from what control teachers reported that many of the students in grades 7 and 8 received some kind of instruction in content area reading. As one teacher put it, "What else would we be teaching in a reading class in junior high?" This was particularly true at grade 8 where nearly all of the control classes were given some instruction in content area reading during the time the series was being used. At grade 7, approximately half of the classes had received instruction. READING FOR A REASON was not used in isolation and was not compared with a total void of any other instruction in content area reading.

Student outcomes were observed that were attributed to the use of the series. Students who used the series scored higher on the Reading Style Inventory than did the control classes, which implies that READING FOR A REASON students at least were more aware of good reading habits and reported performing some of the habits more frequently. Students who had used the series also knew more than the control students about specific skills discussed in the series and, at grade 7, were able to determine the main idea of a passage better after having viewed the series.

The specific information that students learned from the series includes what expository materials are and that knowing your purpose for reading is helpful in getting meaning from reading. Specific techniques that students learned more about were putting what was read into their own words to help remember the content; asking questions about who, what, when, where, why, and how will help to check understanding of what was read; using headings, pictures, and study aids to identify the author's message; and using signal words to help focus attention. Most of these ideas were presented in the programs that teachers rated higher on

instructional value, entertainment, and student appeal--programs 1, 4, and 7. However, some come from the lower rated programs--3 and 5--indicating that student learning occurred even from programs not thought of as highly as the others.

Increases on scales measuring general reading skills were not observed as the result of using READING FOR A REASON except at grade 7 on Main Idea. These skills are developed over a period of time, so it is not surprising that little change occurred over an 8-week period. Also, control classes continued to have some instruction on a variety of reading skills. The short-term impact of the series is directed more toward a change in awareness of ways of improving the effectiveness of content area reading and specific reading techniques presented in the programs than the application of more general reading skills such as inferring a conclusion, denoting cause and effect, and determining fact from opinion.

How do teachers use the series and activities that are included in the teacher's manual?

Teachers who used the series generally thought that the content presented in the programs was not easily available from other resources. For nearly two-thirds of the teachers the content was either new or evenly distributed between new and review materials for their students. Teachers commented that the programs were a valuable tool for teaching content area reading skills. All of these factors suggest that for many of the teachers the series satisfied a need and was important to spend time on.

The importance placed on the series by teachers is reinforced by the number of minutes spent on activities related to each program. The mode of time spent on related activities was approximately 45 minutes. This was divided into 10 minutes for before-the-program activities, 10 minutes for discussion following the program,

10 minutes for after-the-program activities, and 15 minutes for student activity sheets. The mode of time spent on planning was 15 minutes for the first four programs and 10 minutes for the next four programs. As with planning, less time was spent on related activities on the latter programs.

The series was felt to be most appropriate for the intended grade levels of 7 and 8. More felt that the series was most appropriate for grade 8 (81%) than for grade 7 (74%). Because of the range in grade levels and abilities of those who viewed the series as part of the evaluation and the positive response received from nearly all teachers, the series can have some benefit to a diverse group of students, from grade 6 to high school, and of a varying reading ability. A big factor appears to be the situation and what expectations there are for the series. There definitely were some eighth graders that did not relate well to the characters, and there were some sixth graders who had difficulty in keeping up with the content. However, no general trends were found to suggest that for any age group or ability level the series could not be of value.

READING FOR A REASON has a place in the reading curriculum for the middle grades. The series provides content which is needed for these grades and which is not easily available from other sources. The series effectively communicates information about content area reading skills that results in an increased awareness by students of these skills. Teachers were satisfied with the series, spent time doing activities from the teacher's manual, and planned to use the series in the future.

Appendix A

Program Content

Appendix A

Included in this appendix are the title, key idea, and objectives of each program.

Program 1 - "A Different Kind of Reading"

Key Idea - Host: "But getting information from expository reading is something that everybody can learn if they really try...We have to work at this kind of reading."

Objectives - 1. Students will become familiar with the characters and general theme of this series.
2. Students will recognize that narrative and expository writing are different and require different reading objectives.

Program 2 - "I Know the Reason"

Key Idea - Host: "If you know what you're going after, you're much more likely to find it."

Objectives - 1. Students will understand that having a purpose for reading focuses the reader's attention on important ideas.
2. Students will learn strategies for identifying the prupose for reading classroom materials.
3. Students will learn techniques for surveying materials.

Program 3 - "There's a Message for You"

Key Idea - Host: "I wonder what these people could possibly be writing to me about..."

Objectives - 1. Students will tentatively identify the author's message before they begin reading by means of surveying or previewing the assignment.
2. Students will recognize that authors use a variety of techniques to highlight main ideas in textbooks.

Program 4 - "Everything Means Something"

Key Idea - Jeff: "Well, you can't expect the meaning of the words to glow in the dark. You still have to work at it!"

Objectives - 1. Students will be able to recognize signal words that focus the reader's attention.
2. Students will know that main ideas are often located in the first and last sentences of paragraphs.
3. Students will be aware of the fact that punctuation affects the meaning of a sentence.
4. Students will be able to use context to decipher unfamiliar words and ideas.
5. Students will recognize that the sound of language provides clues about meaning.

Program 5 - "I Already Know That"

Key Idea - Jeff: Do you realize how much of the meaning we get from anything we hear or anything we read depends on something we heard before or read before or knew before?"

Objectives - 1. Students will learn to check whether they understand what they have read by asking one or more of the following questions: Who? What? When? Where? Why? How?
2. Students will learn four techniques to help them figure out the meaning of expository writing: using inference, using related or prior information, drawing conclusions, and discussing the passage.
3. Students will know that writers often rely on information they assume the reader already knows or can obtain from the passage to get across their messages.

Program 6 - "Is That a Fact?"

Key Idea - Tina: "Well, that's the whole point. If we don't learn to pick out bias when we read it or hear it, we can be tricked into believing almost anything--especially about subjects we're not familiar with in the first place."

Objectives - 1. Students will know criteria to distinguish between statements of fact and statements of opinion.
2. Students will learn devices for detecting bias.
3. Students will understand the importance of distinguishing fact from opinion and recognizing bias.

Program 7 - "The Way I Remember It..."

Key Idea - Host: "It only makes good sense for us to learn what tools we can use to help us remember."

Objectives - 1. Students will realize that they must work to remember information that they read.
2. Students will learn strategies to use when reading to remember information.

Program 8 - Different Subjects, Different Messages"

Key Idea - Host: "Each different teacher and each different subject and each different textbook presented us with a different kind of message--different information..."

Objectives - 1. Students will review purposes and strategies for reading expository material.
2. Students will be able to apply reading skills for different purposes as required by different situations.
3. Students will recognize the value of reading skills for out-of-school situations.

Appendix B

Student Tests

Appendix B

Student Tests

Included in this appendix are the Reading Style Inventory and the Comprehension of Series Elements administered to students as the posttest. Only a few changes were made in the comprehension scale from the pretest. The reading scales used from the Wisconsin Pupil Assessments are referenced. An * indicates the correct response for an item. Students recorded their answers on the answer sheet which is also included.

Question Booklet

Reading

Do not open this booklet until instructed. Write all of your answers on the answer sheet. Follow the directions given for each part. Please do not write in this booklet.

Some material in this text booklet is copyrighted and cannot be reprinted from this booklet unless further permission is obtained from the publishers.

Part I

Directions: Read the statement and then on the answer sheet circle the response that best describes what you do or what you feel.

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always
1. I am comfortable and at ease while reading textbooks.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
2. I read textbooks in a different way from how I read stories.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
3. When reading a textbook I keep working on the material until I am sure I have the meaning.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
4. I have a definite purpose for reading and I keep it in mind as I read.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
5. While reading, I raise questions about the material being read.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
6. I purposely try to remember what I have read.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
7. I use clues such as headings, pictures, and questions to understand better what I am reading.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
8. I look at surrounding words, sentences, and ideas to determine the meaning of a word I do not know.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
9. I put what I read into my own words to help me remember it.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
10. I ask myself questions like who, what, where, when, why, and how after reading a chapter to be sure I know the message.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
11. I pay attention to punctuations (like , . ") as I read and know how it helps me to get the meaning.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
12. I make a practice of skimming over certain materials to find out what I will be reading about.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always
13. I understand the difference between facts and opinions when I read.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
14. I discuss my assignments with others to help me remember what I have read.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
15. I use different reading skills when reading different subjects.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
16. I am aware that with practice, I can improve my reading skills.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.

Part II

Directions: On the answer sheet, for each question circle the most appropriate response.

17. Reading material which reports facts, details, opinions and ideas is called:
    A. fiction
    *B. expository
    C. narrative
    D. research

18. Class discussions, the assignment, class work, and what will be on a test can help you to know
    A. how the textbook is organized.
    B. what pages to read in a textbook.
    *C. your purpose for reading a textbook.
    D. the main points before reading the textbook.

19. To focus your attention on the important ideas as you read a textbook, you should
    A. know the author's purpose.
    B. read slowly.
    C. form images of what you read.
    *D. know your purpose for reading.

20. The table of contents in a textbook can be used
    A. as an introduction.
    B. to find explanations of terms.
    *C. to see the organization of the textbook.
    D. to help remember what was read.

21. Signal words, the location of sentences in a paragraph, punctuation, and hearing what is read are useful to
    A. determine your purpose for reading.
    B. find the author's opinions.
    *C. find the main ideas.
    D. locate facts.

22. Headings, pictures, study aids, questions, and topics are clues for
    *A. identifyng the author's message in a textbook.
    B. locating main ideas in paragraphs and deciphering their meaning.
    C. distinguishing fact from opinion.
    D. testing your understanding of what is read.

23. When reading a textbook
    A. all the facts are included.
    *B. sometimes you have to put facts together.
    C. facts are always true.
    D. sometimes facts are qualified with "I believe."

24. Three signal words that are helpful to get meaning from textbooks are
    A. with, to, from.
    *B. but, first, furthermore.
    C. send, receive, communicate.
    D. many, maybe, one.

25. To read critically means to
    *A. make judgements about the information.
    B. complain about what is read.
    C. appreciate what is read.
    D. read every word.

26. Asking yourself questions, discussing what you read, forming mental images, and reviewing are ways to
    A. determine the author's bias.
    B. find the main ideas.
    C. determine your purpose for reading.
    *D. remember what was read.

Part III

The items used from the Wisconsin Pupil Assessment Program are found in: "Reading: Part 1 - Educational Reading, and Part 2 - Everyday Reading for Eighth Grade." Wisconsin Pupil Assessment Program, 1980, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1980.

Scale		Reading for A Reason Test Item Number	Pupil Assessment Item Number
III	Factual Information	27	100
		28	101
		29	102
		37	117
IV	Main Idea	30	94
		33	113
		40	104
		42	125
V	Cause and Effect	31	95
		32	96
		35	115
		39	103
VI	Inferring a Conclusion	34	114
		36	116
		38	118
		41	119
VII	Fact from Opinion	43	172
		44	173
		45	174
		46	175

Answer Sheet

Student Number: _____ _____ Name: _____

Grade: _____ School: _____

Date: _____ Town/City: _____

Part I					Part II				Part III			
1. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	17. A.	B.	C.	D.	27. A.	B.	C.	D.
2. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	18. A.	B.	C.	D.	28. A.	B.	C.	D.
3. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	19. A.	B.	C.	D.	29. A.	B.	C.	D.
4. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	20. A.	B.	C.	D.	30. A.	B.	C.	D.
5. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	21. A.	B.	C.	D.	31. A.	B.	C.	D.
6. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	22. A.	B.	C.	D.	32. A.	B.	C.	D.
7. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	23. A.	B.	C.	D.	33. A.	B.	C.	D.
8. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	24. A.	B.	C.	D.	34. A.	B.	C.	D.
9. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	25. A.	B.	C.	D.	35. A.	B.	C.	D.
10. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	26. A.	B.	C.	D.	36. A.	B.	C.	D.
11. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.					37. A.	B.	C.	D.
12. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.					38. A.	B.	C.	D.
13. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.					39. A.	B.	C.	D.
14. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.					40. A.	B.	C.	D.
15. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.					41. A.	B.	C.	D.
16. A.	B.	C.	D.	E.					42. A.	B.	C.	D.
									43. A.	B.	C.	D.
									44. A.	B.	C.	D.
									45. A.	B.	C.	D.
									46. A.	B.	C.	D.

Appendix C

Teacher Questionnaires and Interview Questions

Appendix C

Included in this appendix are the questionnaire administered to teachers using the series, the questionnaire given to the control group, and the questions asked to the teachers in interviews. The frequency of responses to the questionnaire items are recorded next to each item.

ID _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

READING FOR A REASON
Teacher Questionnaire

N=58 teachers

For all questions, please circle the number of the response that is appropriate.
E.g. (1.) Yes
2. No

---

1. Give an overall rating of the series.
   1(2%) 1. Poor
   3(5%) 2. Fair
   13(22%) 3. Good
   32(55%) 4. Very good
   8(14%) 5. Excellent

2. Give an overall rating of the teacher's manual.
   1(2%) 1. Poor
   3(5%) 2. Fair
   19(33%) 3. Good
   23(40%) 4. Very good
   10(17%) 5. Excellent

3. How satisfied were you with the series on the whole?
   1(2%) 1. Not satisfied at all
   1(2%) 2. Not very satisfied
   24(41%) 3. Somewhat satisfied
   31(53%) 4. Very satisfied

4. What is an estimate of the average number of classroom minutes spent each week on the series, including before-the-program activities, the program, and postviewing activities?

   _____ minutes

5. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the series? For each statement, circle the number of the response that tells how you feel.

		Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
5.1	The series is better than most educational television.	1 2(3%)	2 2(3%)	3 17(29%)	4 24(41%)	5 11(19%)
5.2	The series was a waste of time.	1 47(79%)	2 7(12%)	3 3(5%)	4 2(3%)	5
5.3	The story lines were effective in helping to get main ideas across.	1	2 3(5%)	3 4(7%)	4 32(55%)	5 17(29%)
5.4	The technical quality (sound, camera work, picture) was professional.	1 1(2%)	2	3 5(9%)	4 18(31%)	5 33(57%)
5.5	The programs were boring.	1 27(46%)	2 17(29%)	3 6(10%)	4 6(10%)	5
5.6	I will use the series in the future.	1 3(5%)	2	3 5(9%)	4 19(33%)	5 31(53%)
5.7	The teenage characters were effective in communicating main ideas.	1	2 6(10%)	3 9(15%)	4 19(33%)	5 24(42%)
5.8	Tim, the recent graduate, was effective in communicating main ideas.	1	2 2(3%)	3 8(14%)	4 19(33%)	5 29(50%)
5.9	The printed words superimposed on the screen were effective in emphasizing the major points.	1	2 1(2%)	3 1(2%)	4 12(21%)	5 44(76%)
5.10	I liked the character Tim (the host).	1 1(2%)	2 2(3%)	3 13(22%)	4 24(41%)	5 17(29%)
5.11	I liked the characters played by teenagers.	1 1(2%)	2 4(7%)	3 12(21%)	4 20(34%)	5 19(33%)
5.12	My students looked forward to viewing the programs.	1 4(7%)	2 6(10%)	3 15(26%)	4 26(45%)	5 5(9%)
5.13	My students liked the character Tim.	1 2(3%)	2 9(15%)	3 21(36%)	4 18(31%)	5 6(10%)
5.14	My students liked the characters played by teenagers.	1 2(3%)	2 8(14%)	3 12(21%)	4 20(34%)	5 14(24%)

5.15 The activities in the manual were good applications and extension of the main ideas in the programs.	1 2(3%)	2 1(2%)	3 3(5%)	4 32(55%)	5 19(33%)
5.16 The teacher's manual was very useful in using the series.	1 1(2%)	2 3(5%)	3 3(5%)	4 22(38%)	5 28(48%)

6. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the content of the series? For each statement, circle the number of the response that tells how you feel.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
6.1 The content included in the programs is important for my students to know.	1	2	3	4 8(14%)	5 50(86%)
6.2 The content of the series adequately covered the major skills in content area reading.	1	2	3 4(7%)	4 27(46%)	5 26(45%)
6.3 Some important skills in content area reading were not included in the program.	1 7(12%)	2 14(24%)	3 16(28%)	4 17(29%)	5 2(3%)
6.4 The sequence of the programs and topics was appropriate.	1 1(2%)	2 1(2%)	3 7(12%)	4 27(46%)	5 19(33%)
6.5 The content of the programs was accurately presented.	1	2 3(5%)	3 3(5%)	4 21(36%)	5 30(51%)
6.6 The content was presented in a form that was understandable to my students.	1 1(2%)	2 1(2%)	3 7(12%)	4 18(31%)	5 31(53%)
6.7 The program provided information not easily available from other resources.	1 3(5%)	2 6(10%)	3 14(24%)	4 14(24%)	5 20(34%)

7. The amount of content in each program was:

6(10%)	1.	Too much
5(9%)	2.	Not enough
47(81%)	3.	Appropriate for my students

8. The content presented in the series for my students was:

1(2%)	1.	All review
10(17%)	2.	Mostly review
28(48%)	3.	Evenly distributed between review and new material
18(31%)	4.	Mostly new
1(2%)	5.	All new

9. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the statements about outcomes from the series? For each statement, circle the number of the response that tells how you feel.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
9.1 The programs kept the attention of my students.	1 3(5%)	2 6(10%)	3 8(14%)	4 24(41%)	5 15(26%)
9.2 Students learned from the series more about skills for reading textbooks.	1	2 2(3%)	3 6(10%)	4 23(40%)	5 25(43%)
9.3 My students understood the ideas that were presented in the programs.	1	2 2(3%)	3 2(3%)	4 20(34%)	5 31(53%)
9.4 The series helped students to read textbooks more effectively.	1	2 2(3%)	3 10(17%)	4 26(45%)	5 18(31%)
9.5 The series helped students to be more confident in reading textbooks.	1	2 2(3%)	3 15(26%)	4 27(46%)	5 12(21%)

10. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the utility of the series? For each statement, circle the number of the response that tells how you feel.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
10.1 The programs were easy to prepare for.	1 1(2%)	2 1(2%)	3 1(2%)	4 27(46%)	5 27(46%)
10.2 The programs provoked discussion from the students	1 1(2%)	2 9(15%)	3 18(31%)	4 21(36%)	5 7(12%)
10.3 The series is important enough to allocate classroom time to its use.	1 1(2%)	2 2(5%)	3 1(2%)	4 17(29%)	5 36(62%)
10.4 The vocabulary was appropriate for my students.	1	2 2(5%)	3 2(5%)	4 21(36%)	5 32(55%)
10.5 The teacher's manual is easy to use.	1 1(2%)	2 2(5%)	3 3(5%)	4 22(38%)	5 29(50%)
10.6 The manual was of little help in preparing for the programs.	1 33(57%)	2 14(24%)	3 4(7%)	4 3(5%)	5 3(5%)

10.7 The manual has good and usable ideas for follow-up activities.	1 1(2%)	2 2(5%)	3 4(7%)	4 29(50%)	5 21(36%)
10.8 The activities in the manual are interesting enough that I want to take the time to do them with my students.	1 2(5%)	2 3(5%)	3 5(9%)	4 32(55%)	5 15(26%)

11. The pace of the program was:
    - 5(9%) 1. Too slow
    - 6(10%) 2. Too fast
    - 46(79%) 3. Appropriate for my students

12. Please indicate for each group (class) of students of yours who viewed the series the grade level(s), average reading level, number of students in the group, and the type of class (e.g., reading, Title I, English, social studies, etc.)

	Grade Level(s)	Average Reading Level (circle one) Below Grade	At Grade	Above Grade	Number of Students	Type of Class
12.1 Group 1	_____	1	2	3	_____	_____
12.2 Group 2	_____	1	2	3	_____	_____
12.3 Group 3	_____	1	2	3	_____	_____
12.4 Group 4	_____	1	2	3	_____	_____
12.5 Group 5	_____	1	2	3	_____	_____

13. How many other ITV series have you used with your students this school year?
    - 41(71%) 1. None
    - 9(16%) 2. One
    - 3(5%) 3. Two
    - 1(2%) 4. Three
    - 2(3%) 5. More than three

14. For what grade level(s) do you think this series is most appropriate? (Circle all that apply.)
    - 22(38%) 1. 6
    - 43(74%) 2. 7
    - 47(81%) 3. 8
    - 30(52%) 4. 9
    - 11(19%) 5. 10
    - 3(5%) 6. Other (specify) _____

15. What suggestions do you have as to how the manual and/or programs can be made more effective?

_____

_____

_____

16. We will be publicizing the series in a number of publications. Would you care to make any comments about the series that you would allow us to use?

_____

_____

_____

17. Can we use your name?
    1. Yes (your name _____)
    2. No3
18. Any other comments or suggestions: _____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you!

ID _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

Control Group
Teacher Questionnaire

Please answer these questions by circling the number of the response or recording the appropriate information.

E.g. (1.) yes
2. no

1. For each group of students who were given a test and who did not view any of the programs, please provide the following information:

	Range of Grade Level	Average Reading Level Below Grade	At Grade	Above Grade	Number of Students	Type of Class English, Reading, Title I,...)
Class 1:	_____	1	2	3	_____	_____
Class 2:	_____	1	2	3	_____	_____
Class 3:	_____	1	2	3	_____	_____
Class 4:	_____	1	2	3	_____	_____
Class 5:	_____	1	2	3	_____	_____

2. Have any of the classes listed above had any instruction on skills related to content area reading any time this semester?
1. Yes (Explain: _____)
2. No

3. Have any of the classes listed above received any instruction or done any work this semester on any of these topics?

3.1	Differences between expository and narrative material	Yes	No	?
3.2	Need of having a purpose when reading	Yes	No	?
3.3	Recognizing the organization of a text	Yes	No	?
3.4	Techniques for surveying materials	Yes	No	?
3.5	Techniques to highlight main ideas (reading, pictures, study aids, questions and topics)	Yes	No	?
3.6	Clues to locate main ideas (signal words, location, punctuation, context, sounds of words)	Yes	No	?
3.7	Questions to check for understanding of what is read	Yes	No	?
3.8	Use of inference in figuring out meaning from a text	Yes	No	?
3.9	Criteria to distinguish between statements of fact and statements of opinion	Yes	No	?
3.10	Strategies to remember what is read	Yes	No	?

Thank you

Teacher Interview Questions

1. How effective do you feel the series was in helping students become better readers of textbooks?

2. How useful was the teacher guide?

3. What were the reactions of your students to the series and the related activities?

4. What did you like best about the series and the activities?

5. What in the series or in the activities needs to be changed?

6. What other comments do you have about either programs in the series or the teacher guide activities?

Appendix D

T-Test Analysis of Scales Contrasting Different Groups
Checking for Equivalency

Apppendix D

This appendix includes tables containing the results of the t-tests used to check if test groups were comparable.

Table D1

T-test Comparison of Posttest Class Means on Reading Style Inventory by Grade Testing the Effects of Pretesting

Statistic	Test Group: Experimental Pre-Post	Experimental Post Only	Control Pre-Post	Control Post Only
Grade 7				
Posttest Means	56.76	56.07	52.75	52.88
Number of Classes	9	9	4	8
T	0.31		0.06	
Prob.	.76		.95	
Grade 8				
Posttest Means	55.37	56.99	54.50	55.21
Number of Classes	8	11	4	5
T	1.12		0.37	
Prob.	.28		.72	

Table D2

T-test Comparison of Pretest Means of Reading Style Inventory Items Between Experimental and Control Groups by Grade

	Grade 7 Pretest Mean Experimental (N=9)	Grade 7 Pretest Mean Control (N=4)	Grade 7 |T|	Grade 8 Pretest Mean Experimental (N=8)	Grade 8 Pretest Mean Control (N=4)	Grade 8 |T|
1. Comfortable reading texts	3.60	3.50	0.63	3.31	3.54	1.67
2. Read texts differently	3.11	3.39	1.51	3.35	3.61	0.91
3. Work until have meaning	3.41	3.44	0.23	3.18	3.47	2.13
4. Keep in mind purpose	3.30	3.14	0.97	3.09	3.29	1.05
5. Raise questions while reading	2.78	2.76	0.10	2.77	2.72	0.13
6. Try to remember	3.92	3.97	0.42	3.84	3.95	0.50
7. Use clues	3.72	3.81	0.80	3.66	3.97	1.73
8. Word meaning from surroundings	3.92	3.72	0.99	3.68	3.90	0.96
9. Put into own words	3.19	3.15	0.34	3.05	3.01	0.23
10. Ask self questions	2.65	2.74	0.64	2.61	2.81	1.47
11. Attend to punctuation	3.16	3.27	0.62	3.03	3.17	0.79
12. Skim before reading	3.15	3.12	0.14	3.06	3.05	0.04
13. Know fact from opinion	3.96	4.03	0.67	3.99	4.16	1.18
14. Discuss with others	2.76	2.83	0.36	2.62	2.82	1.16
15. Use different reading skills	2.96	3.01	0.26	3.25	3.22	0.16
16. Aware reading skills can be improved	4.36	4.22	0.79	4.19	4.54	2.40*

Note: For a significant level at .05, | T | should be greater than 2.15.
*significant at the .05 level

Table D3

T-test Comparison of Posttest Means of Reading Style Inventory Items Between Experimental Groups Pre-Post and Post Only by Grade

	Grade 7 Experimental Pre-Post (N=9)	Grade 7 Experimental Post Only (N=9)	Grade 7 |T|	Grade 8 Experimental Pre-Post (N=8)	Grade 8 Experimental Post Only (N=11)	Grade 8 |T|
1. Comfortable reading texts	3.47	3.12	1.98	3.38	3.36	0.17
2. Read texts differently	3.80	4.00	1.14	3.81	3.97	1.15
3. Work until have meaning	3.51	3.51	0.03	3.30	3.57	1.91
4. Keep in mind purpose	3.40	3.40	0.04	3.35	3.46	1.04
5. Raise questions while reading	3.03	2.99	0.32	3.08	3.03	0.27
6. Try to remember	4.12	3.94	1.33	3.87	4.10	1.95
7. Use clues	3.77	3.77	0.03	3.71	3.91	1.24
8. Word meaning from surroundings	3.96	3.71	1.38	3.72	3.84	0.88
9. Put into own words	3.43	3.40	0.20	3.33	3.45	0.99
10. Ask self questions	3.00	2.95	0.23	3.01	3.01	0.02
11. Attend to punctuation	3.34	3.30	0.16	3.26	3.45	1.16
12. Skim before reading	3.28	3.26	0.15	3.24	3.21	0.26
13. Know fact from opinion	4.22	4.18	0.35	4.06	4.17	0.82
14. Discuss with others	2.96	2.83	0.68	3.02	2.75	2.30*
15. Use different reading skills	3.33	3.61	1.54	3.30	3.48	1.20
16. Aware reading skills can be improved	4.36	4.27	0.63	4.12	4.29	1.92

Note: For a significant level at .05, need to have |T| value greater than 2.0.
*significant at .05 level

Table D4

T-test Comparison of Posttest Means of Reading Style Inventory Items Between Control Groups Pre-Post and Post Only by Grade

	Grade 7 Control Pre-Post (N=4)	Grade 7 Control Post Only (N=8)	Grade 7 |T|	Grade 8 Control Pre-Post (N=4)	Grade 8 Control Post Only (N=5)	Grade 8 |T|
1. Comfortable reading texts	3.30	3.38	0.49	3.53	3.53	0.04
2. Read texts differently	3.39	3.50	0.60	3.83	3.31	2.08
3. Work until have meaning	3.33	3.26	0.42	3.56	3.51	0.26
4. Keep in mind purpose	3.14	3.04	0.61	3.41	3.30	0.69
5. Raise questions while reading	2.69	2.73	0.19	2.93	2.85	0.31
6. Try to remember	3.78	3.84	0.25	3.74	3.93	1.66
7. Use clues	3.78	3.70	0.42	3.75	3.92	0.76
8. Word meaning from surroundings	3.50	3.54	0.29	3.73	3.90	0.86
9. Put into own words	3.08	3.16	0.47	3.12	3.18	0.28
10. Ask self questions	2.48	2.52	0.26	2.69	2.78	0.50
11. Attend to punctuation	3.27	3.27	0.02	3.31	3.43	0.59
12. Skim before reading	2.94	3.03	0.64	3.18	3.02	1.50
13. Know fact from opinion	3.98	4.04	0.25	3.88	4.30	1.87
14. Discuss with others	2.67	2.66	0.02	2.83	3.00	0.88
15. Use different reading skills	3.19	3.18	0.08	3.36	3.13	1.37
16. Aware reading skills can be improved	4.26	4.22	0.29	4.16	4.29	0.74

Note: None of the |T| values are significant at the .05 level.

Table D5

T-test Comparison of Pretest Means on Reading Scales
Between Experimental and Control Groups by Grade

	Grade 7			Grade 8		
	Experimental Pretest Mean (S.D.) (N=9)	Control Pretest Mean (S.D.) (N=4)	|T|	Experimental Pretest Mean (S.D.) (N=10)	Control Pretest Mean (S.D.) (N=4)	|T|
II Comprehension of Series Elements	4.68 (.72)	4.76 (.41)	.20	4.63 (1.02)	5.24 (.34)	1.16
III Factual Information	3.25 (.35)	3.11 (.16)	.75	2.95 (.43)	3.28 (.31)	1.37
IV Main Idea	.58 (.15)	.60 (.14)	.29	.64 (.18)	.64 (.07)	.04
V Cause and Effect		(No Pretest)				
VI Inferring a Conclusion	2.46 (.36)	2.20 (.55)	1.07	2.32 (.68)	2.89 (.34)	1.56
VII Fact from Opinion	2.93 (.39)	2.85 (.41)	.32	2.80 (.79)	3.34 (.14)	2.07

Note: For a significant level of .05, the 7 value needs to be greater than 2.10.

Table D6

T-test Comparison of Posttest Means on Reading Scales
Between Pretested Group and Post Only by Use of Series and Grade

Scale	Number of Items	Experimental Pre-Post Mean (S.D.)	Experimental Post Only Mean (S.D.)	|T|	Control Pre-Post Mean (S.D.)	Control Post Only Mean (S.D.)	|T|
		(N=9)	(N=9)	Grade 7	(N=4)	(N=8)	
2	10	5.34 (.82)	5.75 (.64)	1.19	4.42 (.20)	4.51 (.47)	0.37
3	4	3.10 (.52)	3.19 (.35)	.40	2.96 (.22)	3.24 (.37)	1.39
4	4	2.18 (.33)	2.24 (.18)	.51	1.75 (.25)	2.06 (.18)	2.58*
5	4	2.28 (.50)	2.52 (.37)	1.15	2.10 (.51)	2.40 (.44)	1.03
6	4	2.46 (.46)	2.36 (.50)	.45	2.02 (.50)	2.39 (.53)	1.12
7	4	2.91 (.68)	3.12 (.34)	.83	2.55 (.46)	2.80 (.36)	1.05
		(N=10)	(N=11)	Grade 8	(N=4)	(N=4)	
2	10	5.13 (1.07)	5.54 (.78)	1.01	4.39 (.26)	4.84 (.66)	1.26
3	4	2.85 (.82)	3.34 (.33)	1.80	2.84 (1.17)	3.33 (.38)	.81
4	4	1.94 (.55)	2.26 (.27)	1.68	1.95 (.45)	2.30 (.14)	1.46
5	4	2.18 (.91)	2.54 (.35)	1.16	2.41 (.52)	2.71 (.36)	.97
6	4	2.20 (.80)	2.63 (.33)	1.60	2.29 (.88)	2.88 (.40)	1.21
7	4	2.61 (.80)	3.18 (.30)	2.11	2.60 (1.32)	3.14 (.32)	.79

Note: For a significant level at .05, the |T| value needs to be greater than 2.15.
*significant at the .05 level

Table D7

Analysis of Variance Testing the Main and Interactive Effects of Pretesting on Posttest Series for Reading Scales by Grade

Scale 2	Grade 7				Grade 8			
Comprehension of Series Elements	Pre-Post Mean	Post Only Mean	Total Mean	Adjusted	Pre-Post Mean	Post Only Mean	Total Mean	Adjusted
Series	5.34	5.25	5.54		5.14	5.54	5.34	
Control	4.42	4.51	4.46	1.08*	4.39	4.84	4.61	.73*
Total Mean	4.88	5.13			4.76	5.19		

ANOVA

Source	DF	SS	F	PR	Source	DF	SS	F	PR
Series	1	8.14	20.47	.0001**		1	3.15	4.42	.04*
Pretest	1	.62	1.55	.22		1	1.28	1.79	.19
Series x Pretest	1	.17	.42	.52		1	.00	.00	.95
Error	26	10.34				25	17.85		
Total	29	19.27				28	22.28		

Scale 3	Grade 7				Grade 8			
Factual Information	Pre-Post Mean	Post Only Mean	Total Mean	Adjusted	Pre-Post Mean	Post Only Mean	Total Mean	Adjusted
Series	3.10	3.19	3.14		2.85	3.34	3.10	
Control	2.96	3.24	3.10	.04	2.84	3.33	3.08	.02
Total Mean	3.03	3.21			2.84	3.34		

ANOVA

Source	DF	SS	F	PR	Source	DF	SS	F	R
Series	1	.00	.00	.99		1	.00	.01	.93
Pretest	1	.18	1.10	.30		1	1.80	3.86	.06
Series x Pretest	1	.07	0.42	.52		1	.00	0.00	1.00
Error	26	4.22				25			
Total	29	4.47				28			

Table D7 (continued)

Scale 4 Main Idea	Grade 7 Pre-Post Mean	Post Only Mean	Total Mean	Adjusted	Grade 8 Pre-Post Mean	Post Only Mean	Total Mean	Adjusted
Series	2.18	2.24	7.21		1.94	2.26	2.10	
Control	1.75	2.06	1.91	.30**	1.95	2.30	2.12	-.02
Total Mean	1.96	2.15			1.95	2.28		

ANOVA

Source	DF	SS	F	PR	Source	DF	SS	F	PR
Series	1	.45	7.47	.01**		1	.00	.01	.93
Pretest	1	.18	3.00	.10		1	.76	4.56	.04*
Series x Pretest	1	.11	1.78	.19		1	.00	.01	.93
Error	26	1.56				25			
Total	29	2.30				28			

Scale 5

Scale 4 Cause and Effect	Grade 7 Pre-Post Mean	Post Only Mean	Total Mean	Adjusted	Grade 8 Pre-Post Mean	Post Only Mean	Total Mean	Adjusted
Series	2.28	2.52	2.40		2.18	2.54	2.36	
Control	2.10	2.40	2.25	.15	2.41	2.71	2.56	-.20
Total Mean	2.19	2.46			2.30	2.63		

ANOVA

Source	DF	SS	F	PR	Source	DF	SS	F	PR
Series	1	.07	0.37	.55		1	.20	.52	.48
Pretest	1	.48	2.38	.14		1	.85	2.14	.16
Series x Pretest	1	.00	0.02	.88		1	.00	.01	.92
Error	26					25			
Total	29					28			

Table D7 (continued)

Scale 6 Inferring a Conclusion	Grade 7 Pre-Post Mean	Post Only Mean	Total Mean	Adjusted	Grade 8 Pre-Post Mean	Post Only Mean	Total Mean	Adjusted
Series	2.46	2.36	2.41		2.20	2.63	2.41	
Control	2.02	2.39	2.20	.21	2.29	2.88	2.58	-.17
Total Mean	2.24	2.37			2.24	2.75		

ANOVA

Source	DF	SS	F	PR	Source	DF	SS	F	PR
Series	1	0.16	.65	.43		1	.15	.38	.54
Pretest	1	.04	.15	.70		1	1.64	4.24	.05*
Series x Pretest	1	.38	1.48	.23		1	.03	.08	.78
Error	26					25	9.68		
Total	29					28	11.50		

Scale 7 Fact from Opinion	Grade 7 Pre-Post Mean	Post Only Mean	Total Mean	Adjusted	Grade 8 Pre-Post Mean	Post Only Mean	Total Mean	Adjusted
Series	2.91	3.12	3.02		2.61	3.18	2.89	
Control	2.55	2.80	2.68	.34	2.60	3.14	2.88	.01
Total Mean	2.73	2.96			2.61	3.16		

ANOVA

Source	DF	SS	F	PR	Source	DF	SS	F	PR
Series	1	.63	2.65	.12		1	.00	.01	.91
Pretest	1	.37	1.56	.22		1	2.26	4.64	.04*
Series x Pretest	1	.00	.01	.90		1	0.00	.00	.96
Error	26	6.14				25	12.20		
Total	29	7.14				28	14.47		

Appendix E

Teacher Comments

Appendix E

In this appendix are the comments that the teachers wrote on the questionnaire. The first set of comments is from the teachers whose students were tested. The second set of comments is from the teachers whose students were not tested.

READING FOR A REASON
Teacher Questionnaire
Comments - Test Group

ID #	Item #	Comments
31901	00	We are an individualized program. We do not test to get grade levels. We test for skill weakness.
49354	00	Test: 1. Judgments misspelled on item 25; 2. You should have pages 11 & 12 facing each other in the test booklet.
31151	04	One class period of 40 minutes was spent for each period. However, time became a factor and because of scheduling and experimental/control grouping, we could not get in the last four programs.
44051	04	Not all programs were viewed due to lack of time.
44941	04	...but I also used some of the programs to introduce activities for a week or more. For example, we used #2 and #3 in conjunction with SQ3R and textbook studies. We used #5 for a week-long study of inference, then spent some time on figurative language.
47291	05.4	Maybe it was just our TV, but I found many of the voices very hard to understand! Turning the TV louder or softer didn't help!
49521	07	Sometimes, because I have all remedial students.
30221	12.1	9-10-11, developmental reading
30861	12.1	7, literature/reading
30862	12.1	8, reading/literature
31151	12.1	4-10, reading
31901	12.1	7-8, reading
32281	12.1	7, reading
35251	12.1	7, reading
35252	12.1	7, reading
35601	12.1	7, reading
35602	12.1	8, reading
39481	12.1	8, language arts
44051	12.1	8, reading
44941	12.1	7, developmental reading
45271	12.1	8, reading
45621	12.1	7, English
47011	12.1	8-9, reading
47291	12.1	7, reading
47571	12.1	8, reading
47731	12.1	7, English
48531	12.1	7, geography
48532	12.1	7, social studies
49111	12.1	8, English
49353	12.1	9, English
49354	12.1	7, remedial--not tested
49355	12.1	8, English
49521	12.1	7, Title I
30221	12.2	9-10-11, developmental reading
31901	12.2	7-8, reading
35252	12.2	7, reading
35601	12.2	7, reading

ID #	Item #	Comments
44941	12.2	7, developmental reading
45621	12.2	8, English
47011	12.2	8-9, reading
47731	12.2	7, English
48531	12.2	7, geography
48532	12.2	7, reading
	12.2	8, English
49351	12.2	7, English
49353	12.2	8, English
49354	12.2	8, remedial--not tested
49521	12.2	8, Title I
31901	12.3	7-8, reading
35601	12.3	8, reading
44941	12.3	7, developmental reading
47011	12.3	8-9, reading
48532	12.3	8, reading
	12.3	8, English
49353	12.3	8, English
49521	12.3	9, Title I
35601	12.4	8, reading
44941	12.4	9, remedial reading (saw only some prog.)
48532	12.4	8, reading
	12.4	8, English
49351	12.4	7, English
35602	14.6	All high school
45621	14.6	and lower
47011	14.6	11-12
47731	14.6	Remedial groups in reading
30862	15	More activities that relate the skills to the students' textbooks and assignments.
31901	15	You have your work cut out for you. This is the first program we've seen for junior high reading so we're glad you attempted a series, but it does need some work. Maybe take a couple of reading in content area techniques and develop a couple of programs around each one. You tried to do too much. Program series too long for this age level. Don't you have any junior high teachers working with you?
35251	15	Since this was our first exposure, I can see where some items need to be omitted and other certainly need more time to develop. I felt the student worksheets most helpful and enjoyable--a good review and culminating activity! However, not enough time was spent from my end.
35252	15	Due to scheduling, I could have used about two weeks more time allotment to adequately use the pre- and post-program activities. Worksheet #5 especially good; worksheet #3, students had difficulty understanding what was wanted.
35601	15	Program #5 was less effective for my students than the others. The content was fine but the presentation was not clear. I also feel more could be done with the memory segment (#7). Worksheet #7 was really not effective. The content of the show was good, however.
39481	15	More suggested post-program activities; perhaps more reproducible worksheets; worksheets with higher interest level.

ID #	Item #	Comments
44941	15	I thought #3 was a total waste of time. The situation presented did not go with the material. Better student actors would improve the flow of the programs. At times I could hardly understand Judy. The students did not like Corey. But they did say that they'd rather have this kind of a presentation--wtih teenage actors--than a lecture, even if it seemed unnatural.
47011	15	Try to avoid giving activities that require students to bring their content textbooks into class. This is too difficult in a split 8th-9th grade class.
47291	15	Improve the sound quality. Maybe the actors could talk a little slower, but I really think it is a technical problem, not an actor's speech.
47571	15	Most of my students disliked Tim, the host. They said he looked too old and his room was not like that of an 18 year old. I disapprove of him being a high school graduate and not having any idea what he will be doing in the fall.
47731	15	The kids really got bored with some of the programs (3-7); they need a bit more "zip" and attention getters.
49111	15	Use for 6 & 7, not 8 or 9, as it talks down. The topic is so well discussed that there is little room for just discussion.
49351	15	Well done--activities for different time slots and reading levels; easy to select activities; facility to reproduce.
49354	15	Some of the teenagers read their lines too quickly. The program could have provided more examples of the students using the skills in actual school settings. The description of the skills in the program was very good.
49355	15	I think the programs should be closer together.
30861	16	I think that the series would be beneficial to use at the beginning of the school year. That way the students would be able to apply the skills and knowledge learned from the series to all their subjects.
30862	16	The series provides students with reading and study skills that they may need for independent learning. All they have to do is apply the skills.
31151	16	My students enjoyed the way in which each program had a specific skill in content area reading.
31901	16	I'm really interested in knowing if anyone else feels the way I do about the series. My suggestions would take more than three lines.
32281	16	The series deals effectively with important skills that are sometimes overlooked in regular reading skills instruction.
35251	16	The series creates interest and main purpose for reading the more difficult expository texts found in every classroom.
39481	16	This series is an excellent supplement to the study skills techniques which my students need to learn at the junior high (7-8) level to help them here and when they transfer to the high school.
47291	16	This program states in an understandable way tips for poor and average readers to get more out of their reading of classroom textbooks.

ID #	Item #	Comments
47571	16	The series showed my students many things they already knew from reading class but never knew to apply to other classes, so it really all was new.
48531	16	A great tool for aiding students in understanding expository materials.
48532	16	I feel the program is excellent. The actual viewing of the techniques in use have an impact on the students. The program is very realistic in its approach.
49111	16	A necessary component for a study skills unit. Valuable tool for a junior high student.
49351	16	Repetition of sets, characters, music promoted sense of continuity and security for the students. Students identified with characters and their reading problems.
49354	16	The READING FOR A REASON program covers skills that are vital for a student to do well in school.
30861	18	I could see the series aiding the students with their schoolwork in general. Even slower students and those reading below grade level could pick up useful hints for studying.
31151	18	Having an experimental group and a control group made planning more complex with my curriculum. Next year I will find it most useful in planning for all eighth graders to view these programs. Because of the two groupings, we wre able to view only the first four programs; we also did not spend as much time as I would have liked on the follow-up activities. I believe the programs do have merit, however, in teaching reading in the content area.
31901	18	Get better organized in terms of activities and materials given to teachers.
32281	18	I would like to see other series of similar nature developed. Good work!
35251	18	We've certainly enjoyed the series and are most pleased we accepted the invitation. However, we were so rushed with so many other items to conclude that not enough time was spent on the program. Next year I'd like to plan this at the <u>beginning</u> of the year.
35252	18	Liked the review in program #8.
35601	18	I found the series to be very effective and worthwhile.
39481	18	More excellent programming like this is always welcome. Since many of us must tape this show for later viewing, how about <u>two</u> showings a week so schools that have conflicts in taping at the 8:15 Tues. schedule would be sure not to miss any episodes?
44051	18	Program should not be broadcast towards end of year; we ran out of time. Also, running the programs once a week left too much time between programs. It would have been nice if all the programs were shown in one, two-hour block. We had trouble video taping all the programs for our jr. high classes to see. We missed one program and the video tape machine was broken for another.

ID #	Item #	Comments
44941	18	Student comments: "The teenagers did not act 'natural'"; "nobody studies together." (I personally felt it was a good idea, but...) The students also commented that the teenage characters seemed "stupid"--did not understand things as well as they might have.
45621	18	We had scheduling problems/taping problems and other difficulties with this series. I think if this would be used at the beginning of the year student reaction may be more positive. Our students were not able to view all programs either. Overall, our experience was not very pleasant--through faults of our own. I hope other questionnaires meet your needs better than this one.
47011	18	This series is more suitable for older students (9th or 10th) than for 7th or 8th graders. It is more suitable for developmental reading than remedial reading.
47571	18	It is my impression that reading/English teachers are the main teachers using this series now. But I question whether the students will transfer these skills to their content areas and <u>independently</u> practice or use them without assistance from their content area teachers. The value of this series would be greatly enhanced if content area teachers were using it either individually or in conjunction with the reading/Englsih teacher. [K-12 Reading Specialist]
47731	18	Overall, I really feel that this type of a program is beneficial in teaching reading skills to use in the content areas. I think the program should be broadcast at the beginning of a school year instead of the end, because those skills could be used <u>all</u> year.
48532	18	The program was presented in a very meaningful manner.
49111	18	Glad I was able to be a part of the program evaluation. May I see the results of the work please? I will definitely use with 7th grade in the fall. Don't wait until March to show this program. I'd like to use it right away in Sept.
49351	18	I would be interested in a similar diagnosis of literature as style--tense, person, etc., present vs. past, I vs. we.
49355	18	I'll prepare differently next year when the series is shown.
49521	18	The series covered many important skills that are not often taught as specifically in the jr. high classroom, but are very important skills for students to learn.

READING FOR A REASON
Teacher Questionnaire
Teacher Review Non-test Group

ID #	Item #	Comments
31701	00	Students were not able to view the program but we worked on some of the worksheets after my explanation and found them very usable.
39481	00	Our use of READING FOR A REASON has been sporadic. Cable TV to our school is broken. What I have used has been good. Thank you for an excellent program.
39541	00	I did not view all of the programs because of limited time, especially during the Iowa testing.
49231	04	Since I was previewing for a class I will be teaching next year, I did not do after-viewing activities.
39541	05.7	Some were a bit unclear in their speech.
47011	06.6	Too hard for 7th grade
39511	09	Much back-up work is needed with remedial students to accomplish this--done in the classroom.
39511	11.2	Too fast for remedial students
41661	11.2	Speaking of teenagers
39511	11.3	Appropriate for regular & accelerated students
30441	12.1	7, reading
32221	12.1	10-12, developmental
34031	12.1	8-9, reading
35321	12.1	8, remedial reading
35341	12.1	8, reading
35451	12.1	7, English
35581	12.1	7, English
35751	12.1	7, language arts
35931	12.1	8, reading
37171	12.1	8, reading
38211	12.1	7-8, emotionally disturbed
39511	12.1	7, remedial reading
39541	12.1	7, language arts
39591	12.1	7, reading
39601	12.1	7, reading (developmental)
40211	12.1	reading
41141	12.1	Teachers, in-service
41661	12.1	7, reading
46011	12.1	7, content reading
46601	12.1	8, Title I
47011	12.1	7, remedial
47281	12.1	8, reading
48321	12.1	7, language arts
49231	12.1	6, developmental reading--but will use with 7th grade below-grade readers
49501	12.1	8, literature
49521	12.1	8, reading
32221	12.2	10-12, developmental
34031	12.2	8-9, reading

ID #	Item #	Comments
35321	12.2	8, remedial reading
35581	12.2	7, Resource (study skills)
35751	12.2	7, language arts
37171	12.2	8, reading
39511	12.2	7, collective reading
39541	12.2	7, language arts
39591	12.2	7, reading
39601	12.2	7, reading
41661	12.2	7, reading
46011	12.2	7, content reading
46601	12.2	9, Title I
47011	12.2	8-9, speed reading (They liked it!)
47281	12.2	8, reading
48321	12.2	7, language arts
49501	12.2	8, literature
49521	12.2	8, reading
32221	12.3	10, ED and LD
34031	12.3	9, reading
35751	12.3	7, language arts
37171	12.3	7, reading
39541	12.3	8, language arts
39591	12.3	7, reading
39601	12.3	8, reading
41661	12.3	7, reading
46011	12.3	8, reading
46601	12.3	7, Title I
47011	12.3	8-9, remedial
47281	12.3	8, reading
48321	12.3	8, language arts
49521	12.3	8, reading
35751	12.4	7, language arts
39541	12.4	8, language arts
39591	12.4	7, reading
39601	12.4	8, reading
41661	12.4	7, reading
46011	12.4	8, reading
46601	12.4	8, Title I
48321	12.4	8, language arts
39541	12.5	7, language arts
39591	12.5	7, reading
41661	12.5	7, reading
46601	12.5	7-8, Title I
41661	12.6	7, reading
32221	13.1	Obviously this influenced my reaction as the tapes were intended for younger groups.
39511	14.6	Should be repeated yearly for remedial students and repeated as students change schools, i.e., 6th middle high to show application at new level.
39602	14.6	11
32221	14.7	Special groups as ED, LD
30381	15	Develop a program for grades 7 and 8 that is similar to this.

ID #	Item #	Comments
30441	15	Some of the follow-up activities were too similar. (My class consists of many accelerated readers. Next year I will use it with the slower readers. Perhaps it will be of more interest and value to them.)
31701	15	I believe it is excellent as is.
32221	15	Series has much potential--liked everything but the dialog. Students reacted negatively to the students in the tape, primarily to the "contrived settings." Suggest using older students. Younger people generally "look up" to those in a more advanced grade.
34031	15	Unfortunately, we could not show the tapes until the end of the school year--they would have been much more successful at beginning of the year. One teacher didn't use them at all because she was absent for 3 days.
35321	15	Students felt "Tim" should be a part of the teenage group discussions instead of always missing.
35581	15	I think trying an activity before the program, then again after, works well because students have tried to outline, for instance, and find it much simpler to do the same task after. This takes some enthusiastic convincing to get the students going, but they are able to see the value of the lesson.
35751	15	The introductory sequence became tedious after the first couple of programs--too long. Include name blanks on all student worksheets.
35931	15	I did not start the program with my students until the third week. I found some of the programs more effective if I used them two or three days in a row.
38211	15	I thought it moved too slowly. Not enough information in the presentations.
39511	15	Remedial students need so much more reinforcement than do average students. Could more suggestions for activities be included?
39541	15	The superimposed words were too low at times.
40211	15	Programs should have been in the fall. It would have helped the students during the year. It was excellent though.
41141	15	All the teachers were enthusiastic about the programs and suggest using them with 5, 6, 7, 8 and high school students not now being successful with their studies.
41661	15	Slow the speakers down on the program.
46601	15	At times, too much information was presented too quickly, e.g., an entire program could have been spent on "signal words." Maybe find one thing to cover per show. Other than that, I think the series was very well done.
47011	15	I should have had the manual. I think it's an excellent program for a 7-9 grade developmental reading class. I just happened to have mostly remedial 7th graders when I viewed it.

ID #	Item #	Comments
47281	15	The introduction to each program is identical and students dislike it. Maybe it could be varied or shortened after the first two programs. For some eighth graders, the students seem a little old to relate to. It is above the level of our seventh graders. We are largely a rural area.
49231	15	Supply actual worksheets that can be dittoed and used.
49521	15	Students complained about Tim sitting on the bed and speaking from his bedroom.
30381	16	I feel the overall program is excellent in assisting the instruction of study skills for students, grades 9-12.
31701	16	Hits main skills children need for study in the content areas with a new approach.
35581	16	The series adds zip, fun and interest to skills that are vital to students' success in school, but often dull and boring to learn and teach.
35751	16	Reading in the content areas and study skills packaged together in a lively and well-paced series.
39511	16	I loved the first five programs of the series, but was unable to view and follow through last three because of missed tapings. Students viewed all programs but I was unable to do follow-up activities. They liked what they saw.
39541	16	Even though the program features reading and content, it can be used to clarify the students' understanding of their own writings.
41661	16	It is a good informative series that all levels (7-10) of students would enjoy. Good visual reinforcement of basic reading skills.
47281	16	This is an excellent method of learning reading skills in the content area. A great "boon" to busy teachers.
48321	16	I tried the series with my 7th graders but it seemed above them. My eighth graders got much more out of it, and I plan to show at least some lessons to my high school remedial reading students next year if it is available.
49521	16	I thought the program was very well done. My students looked forward to viewing it.
30381	18	I felt the program was geared to high school level. I would have only a few 8th graders that would have understood the program. The 9th graders and select students, 10-12, will be presented with this program 1982-83 school year.
32221	18	Appreciate the effort--not much good AV in the field of reading. Series has excellent potential.

ID #	Item #	Comments
35341	18	As a whole I liked the series, but I and my students were bored with a few of the shows. Some of the characters' actions bothered my students.
35581	18	Very well done--congratulations!
38211	18	I feel the programs would be more useful with average-higher level range students. I used the program mainly to get my students interested in content area reading, but they are very difficult to motivate!
39511	18	We have needed a series like this desperately. Thanks for developing a real educational tool for use, especially at middle school level.
39541	18	I found that if I wanted to effectively use the program it took up quite a bit more class time than I had anticipated. This coming year I will be able to arrange my class time accordingly.
39601	18	Even though the material was mainly review for my students, a TV presentation had more impact and credibility.
39602	18	I reviewed programs as reading specialist. I do not teach students reading, but our 7-8 reading teacher did use them and was very pleased.
40211	18	Keep up the good work--in other areas of English.
41661	18	I plan to use the program next year.
46011	18	The first four programs seemed more understandable than the last ones.
47281	18	Next year I will use this at the beginning of the year for eighth graders. It will be used with slow students in grade 9. I particularly liked the student activities. They were varied, called upon the students' creativity, and resulted in excellent learning methods for students.
48321	18	We were only able to view three of the programs--lessons 1, 2 and 4 due to: (1) conflicts with other classroom projects in the spring of the year; (2) the AV director not taping as requested.